

CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST

The Pro and Con Monthly

October, 1932



American Industry and
the Five Day Week

Efforts Toward Shorter Work Days
Progress of the Five Day Week
Emergency Spread of Employment

A New Department --
The Students' Laboratory



All Regular Features



WASHINGTON, D.C.

FIFTY CENTS A COPY



The Congressional Digest

The Pro and Con Monthly

Not an Official Organ, Not Controlled by Nor
Under the Influence of Any Party,
Interest, Class or Sect



A. G. ROBINSON
NORBORNE T. N. ROBINSON
Editors and Publishers

Editorial Offices
Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

Published Every Month, except for July and August.
Current Subscription Rates: \$5.00 a Year, Postpaid
in U. S.; in Canada \$5.25; Foreign Rates \$5.50;
Current Numbers 50c a copy; Back Numbers 75c
a copy; Special Rates in quantity lots (see inside
back cover); Volumes Bound, \$7.50; Unbound,
\$5.00. Address all Orders and Correspondence to:

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST
Munsey Building,
Washington, D. C.



Copyright 1932, by A. G. Robinson,
Washington, D. C.

Entered as Second-Class Matter September 26th,
1921, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C.,
under the Act of March 3, 1879. Additional entry
as Second-Class Matter at the Post Office at Balti-
more, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879;
authorized August 22, 1927.

Contents This Month

	Page
This Month's Pro and Con Feature: American Industry and the Five-Day Week	
Fact Material:	
Foreword	225
America's Trend Toward Shorter Working Hours	226
The Federal Government and the Five-Day Week	228
Extent of the Five-Day Week in 1931	229
Problems Created by the Five-Day Week	230
Present Plans for Spreading Employment, by W. J. Barrett	232
Pro and Con Discussion:	
Should America Adopt the Five-Day Week?	234
William Green, Pro	234
Arthur H. Young, Con	235
H. B. McCormac, Con	237
R. J. S. Schearsenbach, Con	237
H. C. Atkins, Con	237
D. C. Henny, Pro	238
T. N. Garner, Con	239
Charles Cheney, Con	239
W. L. Clause, Con	239
A. L. Humphrey, Con	241
A. M. Mulliken, Con	241
George L. Martland, Con	241
Henry Ford, Pro	242
Fayette R. Plumb, Con	243
Joseph C. Kimball, Con	243
Charles R. Sligh, Con	243
John E. Edgerton, Con	243
D. M. Weir, Con	245
Paul T. Norton, Con	245
James Carey Martin, Con	245
William A. Vawter, Con	245
W. G. Dickie, Con	245
Mary Anderson, Pro	246
Louise Y. Gottschall, Con	247
Judge Elbert H. Gray, Con	247
New York Herald Tribune, Con	247
Henry Abbott, Con	247
Rowland B. Jacobs, Con	247
Bibliography on the Five-Day Week	248
The Students' Laboratory:	
Introduction	250
How Uncle Sam's Laws Are Made	251
Civics Class Becomes the House of Representatives	252
Students' Question Box	254
This Month's Contributors and Sources	254

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST is Indexed in the Readers' Guide

The Congressional Digest

Vol. XI

No. 10

October, 1932



American Industry and The Five-Day Week

Foreword

ONE of the outstanding and interesting results of the economic readjustment that has been going on throughout the United States during the past three years is the nation-wide consideration of the Five-Day Week in industry.

Long prior to the Autumn of 1929, when the stock market debacle brought to the attention of the country the fact that a world-wide industrial upheaval was in progress, the Five-Day Week had not only been under discussion, but was in actual operation in a number of manufacturing plants and building and construction organizations.

In fact, it had been developing in smaller plants for about eighteen years before the Ford Motor Company announced its five-day schedule in 1926 and the American Federation of Labor, in that year, made it an important feature in its general program.

Before the coming of the depression, however, most of the impetus had been given to the movement by labor organizations and much opposition had been voiced on the part of employers.

From 1929 advocacy of the Five-Day Week began to be based on another reason than that advanced by labor organizations. Whereas the labor organizations had demanded it on the ground of what they termed justice to the worker in order that he might have more spare time in which to enjoy life, the situation in industry arising from the depression brought forth a general appeal for parceling out work in a manner that would keep as many workers employed as possible.

Consequently, many plants, in order to take care of as many employees as possible, not only went to the Five-Day Week, but went even further and divided their employees into part-time groups, working two or three days each.

Therefore, in considering the Five-Day Week, all sound students of the problem are at this time careful to differentiate between the present emergency conditions in industry and the normal conditions that prevailed prior to 1929.

In presenting the question to its readers, the CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST has sought to look as far into the past history of America as possible for a review of the progressive movement toward shorter hours of labor.

The chronology of this movement, which begins on page 226, was compiled from reports of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U. S. Department of Labor; an historical sketch of the hours of labor in the United States, by Dr. Rita Dielman of the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and from "The Five-Day Week in Manufacturing Industries," published in 1929 by the National Industrial Conference Board, New York City.

From the last-named publication, the DIGEST has chosen an article, which it considers the best available, for an all-round exposition of the Five-Day Week problem. This will be found on page 230.

Government action on shorter working hours will be found beginning on page 228. The most recent reliable figures on the number of concerns in which the Five-Day Week is in operation as a permanent policy, regardless of emergency conditions, will be found in the report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, beginning on page 229.

On page 232 will be found the report of President Hoover's Organization on Unemployment Relief, written by its secretary, William J. Barrett, dealing with general spread of employment under the existing emergency conditions.

A study of these articles will give the reader a comprehensive view of the present status of the Five-Day Week as a permanent policy and as an emergency policy.

In presenting a Pro and Con discussion of the Five-Day Week, the DIGEST has sought to set forth the basic arguments for and against it. Most of the arguments against the Five-Day Week were written before the advent of the depression. In view of the fact that shorter working periods have been put into operation throughout the country in the interest of spreading employment during the emergency, little has been said recently in opposition to the Five-Day Week as a permanent plan.

Many employers of labor are awaiting the return of normal employment conditions before committing themselves. They are neither committed to the Five-Day Week nor committed against it. Therefore, students must fall back on the viewpoint of those who were against it before the emergency to obtain that side.

Pending in both Houses of Congress are bills providing for the adoption by the Government of the Five-Day Week as a permanent policy. These bills fall into two distinct classes. One class provides for a straight five-day or thirty-hour week for Government employees and the other provides for a five-day or thirty-hour week on all Government contracts.

America's Trend Toward Shorter Working Hours Since 1791

1791

IN May the journeymen carpenters of Philadelphia struck against the master carpenters for a shorter working day, their demand being for a twelve-hour day, from 6 a. m. to 6 p. m. Prior to that the working day for artisans as well as farmers had been from sun up to sun down. This made a fairly short day in winter but an extremely long one in summer. The carpenters complained that the masters paid them by the day in summer, when the hours were long, and by the piece in winter, when the days were short. The carpenters lost their strike.

The working hours for labor at that period averaged 12 hours or about 72 hours a week in the mills of the Northern Colonies and about three hours per week longer in the Southern Colonies. These conditions appear to have prevailed for about twenty years after the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

1822

THE movement for a shorter working day was revived in Philadelphia by the journeymen millwrights and machine workers, who demanded a 10-hour day, but their efforts were unsuccessful.

1825

SIX hundred house carpenters struck for a 10-hour day, but the strike was broken.

1827

IN June 600 journeymen carpenters struck in Philadelphia for a 10-hour day in summer and a 9½-hour day in winter. Workmen in other trades, including bricklayers, glaziers and painters, struck in sympathy with the carpenters, but the builders advertised for 300 to 400 carpenters and builders to come to Philadelphia, and the strike ended.

1829

ON April 23d a meeting of mechanics was held in New York at which time a demand for a 10-hour day was voted. This demand was acceded to and the 10-hour day was established.

1831

IN December the New England Association of Farmers, Mechanics and Workingmen was formed in Boston to better the conditions of the laboring class and to regulate the hours of labor. The program included a 10-hour day, with one-tenth of a day's wages for each hour of overtime. After an unsuccessful attempt to bring about a 10-hour day this organization turned its attention to political and educational problems.

1832-1834

IN various cities efforts were made by workmen to bring about 10-hour day agreements. Some were successful and some met with failure.

1835

IN June a general strike was declared in Philadelphia which involved the building trades, cigarmakers, carters, saddlers, harness makers, plumbers, bakers, printers and unskilled workers on the docks. The City Council of Philadelphia granted a 10-hour day to workmen employed by the city and their action was followed by the master carpenters in allowing a 10-hour day in that trade. Strikes occurred in other cities during this period with varying results, but the agitation for shorter working hours was continued by mechanics and factory workers.

After making unsuccessful appeals to Congress for legislation for a shorter working day, labor early in this year, appealed directly to President Jackson, who ordered the 10-hour day established on Government work.

On March 31st, President Van Buren issued an executive order, making the 10-hour day on Government work a permanent policy.

1845

A COMMITTEE was appointed by the Massachusetts legislature to investigate the hours of labor. Their report showed that factory hours ranged from 11 hours and 24 minutes in December and January to 13 hours and 35 minutes in March, but no legislation was recommended.

1847

THE first state law for a 10-hour day was enacted by the New Hampshire Legislature. The law provided that a 10-hour day should prevail "unless otherwise agreed to by the parties" and also provided that no minor under 15 years old could work more than 10 hours a day without the consent of his parent or guardian. This law came as the result of a two year fight in the New Hampshire Legislature.

1848

THE Pennsylvania Legislature passed a law providing that no person should be required to work in the cotton, woolen, silk, paper, bagging and flax factories more than 10 hours a day or 60 hours a week. This resulted in a lockout of 2,000 men in Pittsburgh factories after they had refused to work more than 10 hours. After several weeks of discussion the 10-hour day was agreed upon with a 16 per cent cut in wages.

Other states followed with 10-hour labor laws up to 1870, when the 10-hour day for mechanics and factory workers prevailed generally throughout the country.

1909

THE 10-hour day was generally prevalent on the railroads.

1842

THE caulkers and carpenters in the Boston Navy Yard were granted an 8-hour day. This is considered the first 8-hour day ever established in the United States.

1853

THE joiners in the Boston Navy Yard were put on an 8-hour day, but most of the labor disputes in the 50's were generally over the matter of wages rather than over the hours of work.

1865

THE general movement for an 8-hour day was started in Boston by Ira Stewart on the ground that in his leisure the workman would raise his standard of living which would create new economic wants.

1866

A LABOR CONGRESS was held at Baltimore as the result of which the National Labor Union was organized.

1867

IN Illinois, Missouri and New York 8-hour laws were passed. Wisconsin passed an 8-hour law for women and children.

1868

THE United States Congress passed an 8-hour law for laborers employed on Federal Government work.

1881-1885

IN this period various labor organizations passed resolutions for an 8-hour day and some went on record in favor of a general strike to this end. In 1885 the Federation of Organized Trades and Labor Unions voted to call a general strike.

1886

ON May 1st a general 8-hour strike began, led by the building trades, furniture makers and cigar makers. Of the 340,000 workers who struck, 42,000 obtained the 8-hour day. More than 100,000 other workers obtained the 8-hour day without a strike.

It was during this strike that anarchist plots resulted in bombings in Chicago and impelled President Grover Cleveland to call out Federal troops. The appearance of the anarchists in the situation militated against labor organizations and lost them public support with the result that many who had won the 8-hour day lost it.

In December the American Federation of Labor was organized at Columbus, Ohio.

1888

THE American Federation of Labor at its annual convention in December adopted a resolution for a general demand for an 8-hour day. Instead of calling a general strike it was decided that the carpenters should strike first and, if they were successful, the mine workers were to follow.

1890

ON May 1st, the carpenters began striking with varying success in different localities. The mine workers did not strike, as they did not consider conditions favorable.

1892

ON August 1st, Congress passed an act for an 8-hour day for laborers and mechanics on all Federal public works.

1908

IN its report on the Five-Day Week, printed in 1930, the National Industrial Conference Board credits a spinning mill in New England, organized in 1908, with being the first manufacturing plant to adopt the five-day week. The reason was that the majority of the management and employees were Jews who desired to observe the Hebrew Sabbath and, therefore, to eliminate all work on Saturday.

For the decade that followed, progress in the adoption of the five-day week was slow. Only a few small plants here and there putting it into effect. About 11 plants established the five-day week during this period.

1912

ON June 19, Congress passed an Act providing for an 8-hour day on all contracts in which the Federal Government is party in the United States, any Territory and the District of Columbia.

1916

THE Adamson Act providing for an 8-hour day for employees on all carriers engaged in interstate commerce, except independently owned lines of less than 100 miles in length, was passed by Congress.

1919

THE Federal Census of Manufacturers showed that in that year almost 50 per cent of workmen employed in manufacturing were employed for 48 hours a week, whereas 8 per cent worked 48 hours a week in 1909 and 12 per cent in 1914.

1921

IN this year the number of plants in which the five-day week was operating was increased by 25, in spite of the fact that this was a period of depression in American industry.

1925

THE number of five-day week plants had increased by 51.

1926

THE Ford Motor Company announced its adoption of the five-day plan.

1928

ON November 19th, the executive council of the American Federation of Labor in its report to the AFL annual convention at New Orleans stated that 164,497 of its members were at that time working on a five-day, 40-hour a week basis, as well as 550 office workers, distributed among 20 international unions.

The majority of these, according to the National Industrial Conference report, were employed in the five building trades—bricklayers, carpenters, plasterers, painters and electric workers. The Conference Board estimates that a total of 400,000 workers were on a five-day week in this year.

1929

ON August 24th, an agreement went into effect between the Building Trades Employers' Association and the Building Trades Council in New York City for a five-day week with a 10 per cent increase in wages to compensate for the loss of a day's work. This agreement, covering New York City, is believed to have added between 125,000 and 150,000 workers to the aggregate of those on a five-day basis. Building trades in other cities followed and increased the number further.

1930

THE National Industrial Conference Board's report of this year was based on studies covering the practices of 270 companies, all of which were on a five-day basis. The arrival of the economic depression caused a general shift to part-time work all over the country, less on account of the principle of the shorter hours working period than on account of a desire to distribute employment among as many workers as possible.

The Federal Government and the Five-Day Week

ACTION by the Federal Government on the reduction of working hours took definite form during the past session of Congress, when Congress passed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation bill and when it put an amendment on the Legislative Appropriation bill providing for furloughs for certain classes of government employees.

Under the law creating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the Corporation makes the following requirements for loans on construction work:

(a) Except in executive, administrative, and supervisory positions, so far as practicable no individual directly employed on any project shall be permitted to work more than thirty hours in any one week.

(b) In the employment of labor in connection with any project preference shall be given, where they are qualified, to ex-service men with dependents.

(c) No convict labor shall be directly employed on any project.

That section of the Legislative Appropriation bill, passed in June, which provides for furloughs and pay cuts for government employees, reads:

SECTION 101. During the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933—

(a) The days of work of a per diem officer or employee receiving compensation at a rate which is equivalent to more than \$1,000 per annum shall not exceed five in any one week, and the compensation for five days shall be eleven-tenths of that payable for a week's work of five and one-half days: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as modifying the method of fixing the daily rate of compensation of per diem officers or employees as now authorized by law: *Provided further*, That where the nature of the duties of a per diem officer or employee render it advisable, the provisions of subsection (b) may be applied in lieu of the provisions of this subsection.

(b) Each officer or employee receiving compensation on an annual basis at the rate of more than \$1,000 per annum shall be furloughed without compensation for one calendar month, or for such periods as shall in the aggregate be equivalent to one calendar month, for which latter purpose twenty-four working days (counting Saturday as one-half day) shall be considered as the equivalent of one calendar month: *Provided*, That where the nature of the duties of any such officer or employee render it advisable, the provisions of subsection (a) may be applied in lieu of the provisions of this subsection: *Provided further*, That no officer or employee shall, without his consent, be furloughed under this subsection for more than five days in any one calendar month: *Provided further*, That the rate of compensation of any employee furloughed under the provisions of this Act shall not be reduced by reason of the action of any wage board during the fiscal year 1933.

(c) If the application of the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) to any officer or employee would reduce his rate of compensation to less than \$1,000 per annum, such provisions shall be applied to him only to the extent necessary to reduce his rate of compensation to \$1,000 per annum.

SEC. 102. No officer or employee shall be exempted from the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of section 101, except in those cases where the public service requires that the position be continuously filled and a suitable substitute can not be provided, and then only when authorized or approved in writing by the President of the United States. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget shall report to Congress on the first Monday in December in 1932 and 1933 the exemptions made under this section divided according to salary, grade, and class.

SEC. 103. All rights now conferred or authorized to be conferred by law upon any officer or employee to receive annual leave of absence with pay are hereby suspended during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933.

Extent of the Five-Day Week

in 1931

A CENTURY ago a man's work was from sun-up to sun-down—11, 12, and 13 hours a day. These were the hours of the building trades and of shop and factory workers. During the years, hours have been reduced gradually to 10, to 9, to 8, and in some instances to 7, this movement being led mainly by the organized building trades. Outside of the workers in the building trades few employees in industry were on an 8-hour-workday basis prior to the beginning of the World War. During 1915 and 1916 certain workers engaged in the manufacture of war munitions demanded the establishment of an 8-hour basic day. After the entrance of the United States into the war the various governmental agencies gave considerable impetus to the movement for a shorter working-day by establishing an 8-hour day for all Government work connected with the building of camps and cantonments and work in shipyards.

The next move for the reduction of working hours was for a shorter working-day on Saturday. Between

1915 and 1919 the Saturday half day of work became quite general in the organized building trades and in business offices, and was not unknown in manufacturing establishments.

In more recent years there has come the desire for a full holiday on Saturday—the 5-day week. The annual union-wage surveys made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics show an increasing extension of the 5-day week in the building trades. In 1930, 55.5 per cent of the building-trades workers in the localities covered by the survey had a 5-day week. According to information available to the bureau, in June, 1931, a 5-day work week was in existence in 190 cities and towns for one or more of the crafts in the building work, and in 44 cities and towns all crafts of the building trades were working on a 40-hour basic week.

In order that comprehensive statistics might be available as to the extent to which the 5-day week has gained a fixed place in manufacturing and other industries, questionnaires were recently sent out by the Bureau of Labor Statistics to a large number of establishments. Reports were received from 37,587 establishments in 77 different industries. The establishments questioned were those that regularly cooperate with the bureau in making

Continued on page 255

ESTABLISHMENTS IN WHICH ALL EMPLOYEES WERE ON 5-DAY-WEEK BASIS, 1931, BY INDUSTRY

Industry	Number of Establish- ments.	Number of Employees.	Industry	Number of Establish- ments.	Number of Employees.
Manufacturing			Manufacturing		
Aircraft	6	2,334	Lumber, sawmills	6	1,536
Automobiles	22	91,066	Machine tools	7	296
Auto tires and inner tubes	4	2,305	Mechanical rubber goods other than boots, shoes, auto tires and tubes	11	2,677
Baking	5	617	Millinery and lace goods	3	183
Brass, bronze, and copper products	7	127	Paint and varnish	9	177
Brick, tile, and terra cotta	8	434	Paper boxes	19	1,413
Car building and repairing, steam railroad	3	312	Paper and pulp	3	763
Carpets and rugs	4	1,007	Pianos and organs	3	87
Carriages and wagons	3	17	Pottery	6	258
Cash registers, adding and calculating ma- chines	1	579	Printing, book and job	21	3,296
Cast-iron pipe	1	85	Radio	3	5,544
Chemicals	6	1,140	Shirts and collars	8	557
Chewing and smoking tobacco and snuff	3	1,604	Silk goods	18	3,171
Cigars and cigarettes	19	2,674	Slaughtering and meat packing	1	24
Clothing, men's	31	7,566	Stamped and enameled ware	3	419
Clothing, women's	83	3,620	Steam fitting and steam and hot-water heating apparatus	6	1,736
Confectionery	18	1,926	Stoves	7	649
Cotton goods	36	9,760	Structural-iron work	6	271
Dyeing and finishing textiles	21	5,216	Woolen and worsted goods	30	7,467
Electrical machinery, apparatus, and supplies ..	17	9,007			
Fertilizers	2	19	Miscellaneous		
Flour	1	58	Bituminous coal mining	11	1,071
Foundry and machine-shop products	51	15,191	Canning and preserving	5	713
Furniture	18	1,352	Crude petroleum producing	5	58
Glass	3	474	Laundries	31	883
Hardware	1	20	Metalliferous mining	1	82
Hosiery and knit goods	17	3,366	Quarrying and nonmetallic mining	15	1,018
Iron and steel	3	269	Retail trade	3	57
Jewelry	11	835	Wholesale trade	5	69
Leather, boots and shoes	8	988			
Leather goods other than boots and shoes	1	45	Total	673	199,319
Lumber, millwork	13	831			

Problems Created by the Five-Day Week

THE five-day week work schedule is not, as is frequently assumed, a novelty of the last few years. The earliest instance of its use noted in this study occurred in 1908, and in this case the short weekly work arrangement has been maintained continuously for twenty years. Five of the 270 companies herein reported were found to be operating on a regular five-day schedule, which had been introduced prior to 1914. The greatest progress in the movement for the shorter work week, however, has been made since 1923, as evidenced by the fact that 71% of the companies reporting the date of introduction of the five-day week had adopted this schedule between 1923 and 1928.

The total number of wage earners employed under a permanent five-day schedule is not definitely known. However, data published by the American Federation of Labor in November, 1928, indicate that 164,479 of its members in twenty trades were at this time on this schedule, and the Conference Board's study shows 270 manufacturing companies employing 216,921 persons on the basis of a five-day work week. Allowing for a certain amount of duplication and also for cases of five-day operation that were not discovered in either study, it would seem safe to estimate that about 400,000 persons were working on a five-day weekly basis at the close of 1928. This number for 1928 was substantially exceeded with the granting of the five-day week to large groups of building trades workers in August, 1929.

Yet, in spite of the fact that the five-day week has been adopted more widely than is perhaps generally realized, it still applies to only a relatively small proportion of the industrial working population. The total number of wage earners employed by the 270 companies reported in this study to be operating on a permanent five-day schedule constituted only about 2.6% of the industrial wage earners in this country, and 80% of this number were employed by the Ford Motor Company. Consequently, while the growth in recent years and the present status of the five-day week are significant, this significance lies more in the future possibilities than in the present importance of this work arrangement.

Companies that employ this work schedule represent a number of industries and types of processing, but they are generally of the non-continuous, as contrasted with the continuous-process type. Where the process has no fixed time element, the five-day schedule appears to be susceptible of wide application, but in continuous-process industries a five-day week for employees must mean either the loss of one or two days' production each week or the employment of additional workers to provide a form of revolving shift. It is the latter expedient that has enabled the Ford Motor Company to apply the five-day principle even to the operation of coke ovens, blast furnaces and open hearth steel works.

In general, it may be stated that the five-day week is more prevalent in small than in large establishments, and that most of the exponents of this schedule in the indus-

trial field are located in the northeastern section of the country, particularly in and around New York City. The Ford Motor Company is an outstanding exception to both of these generalizations.

The change from a five-and-one-half or a six-day to a five-day weekly working schedule is likely to raise certain questions of administrative policy. Even if the shift to the shorter schedule is accomplished without a reduction in total number of working hours per week, the question of relative efficiency and of quantity and quality of output in the longer working day is raised, and also the question whether the rate of pay for Saturday work, when necessary, shall be straight time or overtime.

The first problem in a consideration of five-day week operation is the disposition of hours formerly worked on Saturday. These may be distributed over the five working days in such manner that none of the former working time is lost; part of the Saturday hours may be retained and allotted among the other days and the remaining time dropped; or all of the Saturday hours may be eliminated from the weekly work schedule. Eighty-six per cent of the 219 companies that furnished information as to the policy followed in this matter had reduced their total working hours per week in changing to the five-day week, some only slightly, others substantially. Where the change had come as the result of an agreement with organized labor, the work week under the five-day plan was usually set at forty hours.

In some cases, the adjustment of the work week to five days had been rendered difficult by legislation limiting the hours per day during which women could be employed.

With the hours of work per week reduced in changing to the five-day week, the question of possible wage adjustment immediately arises. If the five-day schedule is imposed by organized labor, as was the case in certain apparel industries, the five-day, 40-hour week without change in wage scales is usually specified. Since wage scales in these trades are customarily on a weekly basis, this arrangement results in fewer hours of work per week without reduction in wages. Where decisions on these matters have been made without pressure from labor unions some companies have altered wage scales to permit the earning of as high, or nearly as high, wages under the shorter schedules as under the longer, while others have left the wage scales unchanged. In some cases hourly rates were adjusted and piece rates remained at former levels, on the theory that piece work permits employees to maintain their former weekly earnings if they apply themselves sufficiently to their work.

In some unionized plants covered in this study, overtime work was forbidden and therefore all Saturday work was under the ban. Other plants had not found Saturday work necessary at any time. About a third of the plants which furnished information on this subject, however, had found it advisable, at one time or another, to operate on Saturdays. In approximately two-thirds of these establishments Saturday work was placed in the same category as other overtime work and was compensated at higher than normal rates, but in 30% of the establishments the regular rates remained in force for Saturday work.

A considerable majority of companies that paid higher than normal rates for Saturday work paid on the basis of time and one-half, but a few instances were noted in which double time was paid.

The effect upon production is likely to be the test by which the practicability of the five-day week is judged, but it is difficult to demonstrate this effect statistically. Changes in product or process, in administrative procedure or in business conditions, often coincide with the shift in working schedules, so that it is impossible to determine with any accuracy the effect of the five-day schedule upon output. But, while exact statistical comparison may be impossible, managements appear to hold settled beliefs as to whether the shorter schedule has or has not affected the volume of output. The executives of 127 companies expressed convictions upon this point. In 68% of the plants in which hours per week had been reduced in changing to the five-day schedule, it was believed that output per week had been maintained or increased. This same condition was found in 97% of the establishments in which no change had been made in the weekly total of hours of work. In all, 75% of the reporting companies expressed no complaint on the score of reduction in total output.

Certain economies are attributed to five-day operation. The uneconomical overhead cost of operating a plant on Saturday half-days is eliminated, and, particularly in companies which maintain their own steam power plant, this is by no means a negligible item. Moreover, since output on Saturday half-days has quite generally been found to be below standard, the distribution of this time, of part of it, over the other five days has tended to produce higher output per hour for the week. Even where the Saturday time had not been made up, the elimination of these hours has not been regarded as a total loss. Where processes required rather elaborate and time-consuming starting and stopping procedure, the elimination of one such routine a week has meant a substantial saving in unproductive time and expense.

Considerable stress has been laid upon the advantage of devoting Saturday afternoons to careful overhauling and repair of plant and equipment. It was the general experience that such work was performed more thoroughly when plenty of time was available, and that the consequent reduction in machine breakdowns during productive operation constituted a definite gain towards more economical production.

Attendance and punctuality were generally found to be improved as a result of five-day operation. Furthermore, such a schedule was thought to attract and hold desirable employees, whose appreciation of the two free days each week found expression in the volume and quality of their output. Employers generally were satisfied that the shorter working schedule has had a pronounced effect in raising the morale of the working force.

Objections reported to the five-day week, or to certain features of it, were neither so frequent nor so fundamental as the advantages cited in its favor. Employers who had adopted this schedule at the instigation of organized labor, as a rule considered it an imposition and were disinclined to see it in a favorable light. Others admitted disadvantages or handicaps, but did not consider them insurmountable. The fact that Saturday is an important day in some industries has made it difficult to accustom pur-

chasers to the fact that the plant is closed on that day. A few employers expressed disapproval that some employees accepted other remunerative employment on the day that it was believed should be devoted to rest and recreation. Others questioned whether the distribution of Saturday hours over the other five days had not made these days too long for best results, especially in the high temperature of the summer and in the longer hours under artificial light in the winter. In some cases a decline in quality of work has been attributed to this cause.

The attitude of employees appears to have been quite universally favorable to the five-day schedule, even when it had resulted in some loss in wage earnings. Married women, in particular, appreciate the extra time for household duties, and men value the day for making repairs on their houses and cultivating their gardens or attending to other personal matters. Throughout the year one trip to and from the plant for only a half-day's earnings is eliminated, and in the summer months the longer weekend makes possible the enjoyment of trips farther away from home. General experience with the five-day weekly work schedule led both the employers and employees represented in this study to favor this arrangement.

Like most departures from prevailing practice, the five-day week, at least at first, has certain drawbacks. With respect to this issue, however, the disadvantages appear to have been outweighed by the advantages derived. The preponderance of opinion in favor of the five-day week schedule indicates that in most plants reporting it has commended itself to both management and working force.

The conclusion that any or all industrial establishments could advantageously adopt the five-day week schedule does not follow from the evidence offered in its favor by a majority of the companies that are qualified from experience to appraise its advantages and drawbacks. This evidence does, however, remove the five-day week from the status of a radical and impractical administrative experiment and places it among the plans which, however revolutionary they may appear to some, have demonstrated both practicability and usefulness under certain circumstances. An employer who is interested in the adaptability of the five-day schedule to his own business may, therefore, approach the problem as a working schedule that has been in force for a number of years in various establishments with generally satisfactory results.

Whether or not the application of the five-day week will be extended to industry generally, and whether such extension would be economically sound and socially desirable, are questions that lie in the field of conjecture and opinion and outside the scope of this study. The relatively very small number of individual instances of its application here surveyed, and the circumstances, sometimes inherent in special cases and sometimes imposed, under which the applications were made, afford no adequate basis for answering the broader economic and social questions reflected in the shortening of working hours. In the end, the question of the length and arrangement of the working week is likely to be settled, not on the basis of theoretical principles but by the practical experience of employers and workers, individually and in groups; and the general practice may ultimately even run counter to these principles and ignore the theoretical problems involved.—*Extracts, see I, p. 256.*

Present Plans for Spreading Employment

by W. J. Barrett, Secretary

President's Committee on Unemployment

THE initial recommendation of the Committee on Employment Plans and Suggestions of the President's Organization on Unemployment Relief concerns itself solely with the spreading of work and addresses American industry and business as follows:

All work now available should be equitably distributed among those normally employed in each unit of the various industries, both public and private, in so far as it is practicable to do so.

The spreading of employment has assumed a major role as an unemployment relief measure during the present depression. The policy of spreading employment allows distribution of available wages among as many employees as possible and tends to reduce the number who would necessarily have to apply to charity if deprived of their jobs. While it is unfortunate that some companies have been forced to lay off some of their workers, and others have done so as a matter of policy, it is encouraging to know that an increasing number of organizations are making strenuous efforts to keep as many men and women on the pay roll as possible.

An analysis of the methods used for spreading employment in 394 companies reporting to the President's Organization on Unemployment Relief showed the following distribution:

Method	Number of companies using method
Reduced days per week.....	125
Alternating individuals or shifts.....	82
Reduced hours per week.....	61
Reduced hours per day.....	59
Rotation of days off.....	16
Shortened shifts in continuous operation.....	12
No reduction in men or hours.....	33
Unclassified as to the method of spreading work....	62

Several companies reported the use of two or more methods for spreading employment and for that reason the total of the above exceeds the number of companies reporting.

Reduction in the working time is the principal method of spreading employment. This lessening of the working time is accomplished in one of several ways: viz., reduction in the days worked per week, reduction in the hours worked per day, alternating individuals or shifts, shortening shifts in continuous operation, or the rotation of time off. All of these methods have been widely used, some companies having employed two or more in their efforts to spread employment as equitably as possible.

A great many companies have adopted the 5-day week, having temporarily or permanently abandoned the former 5½ or 6 day working week. In so doing, these companies have continued to operate the normal number of

hours per day. When it becomes necessary to further reduce the number of working hours, some companies continued to work the full number of hours per day, reducing the number of days worked per week; while others reduced the hours per day, continuing to operate for 5 days per week.

The experience of several companies demonstrates the practicability of the various methods of spreading employment outlined above.

In numerous cases companies included as part of their plan for spreading employment a periodic audit and analysis to show forth all cases of uneven spreading as well as all incomes below the minimum cost-of-living budgets for workers. A food products company has made it a policy to see that at least one in each family is employed. There was apparent a wide realization of the possible dangers if the results of the work-spreading plan were not watched closely, particularly as regards the employees' individual needs.

Through various adaptations of the methods of reducing working time many companies have been able to maintain employment for their entire normal working force. The executive of a machinery manufacturing company in summing up the desirability of giving work to the entire normal force, wrote as follows: "When a workman has a job he has some cash and some credit; when he is out of a job he has neither."

Some communities have sought to have their industries reduce hours of work where possible and take on their former workers, or those from other companies less fortunately situated. This plan usually embodies a central agency which acts as an exchange and makes possible the absorption of many workers.

While the reduction in working time is the method used most frequently for increasing the working force, many other means have been introduced for increasing employment.

In the matter of overtime work, there are two definite and opposing opinions. Some companies impose definite limits on the amount of time that an employee can work, and any necessary work over that amount must be performed by others. In some instances this is accomplished by additional employees working during the daytime, while in others the extra employees work after the regular working hours.

Several companies, however, prefer to use their regular employees for all required overtime. One company adopted this policy so that the employees share in prosperity through overtime during peaks, since they are also asked to share the adversity of a depression.

Maximum limits of work, above which no employee can go, have been adopted by several companies, while a few others have set minimum limits as well. The purpose of this procedure is to insure as equitable a distribution of employment as possible, as well as keeping the amount of employment given to all workers retained large enough so that the wage received will be sufficient for sustenance.

In several instances, the development of new products

has been responsible for giving employment to a larger number of workers than would otherwise be the case.

A company engaged in the manufacture of electrical apparatus has been able to keep its engineering and sales forces intact through the development of new products. Another company, by developing a new line of filing equipment, expects to be able to put a large number of its former employees back to work. Several companies, manufacturing standard products, have undertaken the manufacture of special products to give employment to their regular workers.

Training old employees for new jobs and interdepartmental transfer of employees have been used by many companies in spreading employment. While this procedure is used primarily by companies in which the several departments have differing seasonal peaks, it has been used often during the present depression in companies whose various products have not been affected in the same proportion.

Much of the transfer of employees has been from productive to nonproductive work, such as maintenance and construction. One company, manufacturers of precision instruments, writes:

"During the process of rebuilding our power house we have distributed work such as pipe fitting, laying electric lines, laborers' work, etc., among our own people as much as possible. In fact, one of our most enthusiastic pipe fitters today is a precision worker. This has relieved the employment situation as far as our factory is concerned."

Temporary lay-off of employees has been unavoidable in some instances. In such cases a complete study of personnel is often made, with a view to laying off those who will be affected the least. Generally, married women with husbands working are the first to be discharged, any replacements necessary being women or men with dependents. Men without dependents are the next to be laid off. Where the study shows that two or more wage earners in 1-family group are employed in the plant, one of these is laid off.

The previous paragraphs have referred primarily to the methods used for spreading employment among wage earners and productive labor. In some instances, companies have been able to use a similar plan for the salaried employees, such as clerks, supervisors, and minor executives. The majority of companies have been forced to reduce the salaries of clerical and office employees and some have resorted to the 5-day week. Very few examples have been found where alternating individuals or the rotation of time off has worked successfully for these types of workers.

One company reports, "The office force has been reduced somewhat, mostly by employees quitting. We have not replaced them." Another company states that the salaries of all officers and employees were reduced on a common percentage basis. Still a third company reports, "The clerical and sales force have been kept on full time at reduced rates. For a short period, these employees worked five days instead of six, with pay accordingly, but this plan was abandoned about six months ago." A manufacturer of structural steel has transferred all employees except superintendents, department heads, and engineers from salary to hourly pay roll as a matter of policy.

Still another company has reduced the schedule of its office employees to 4 days each week. The clerical force

of a manufacturer of textile machinery has had two reductions in hourly schedules, the first from 44 to 40 hours a week, and the second to 35 hours a week.

There is no one fixed method for spreading employment which is applicable to all organizations. Some companies find it more economical to reduce the number of days worked per week, while others, in order to insure prompt deliveries prefer to operate five or six days per week but with a fewer number of hours per day. Some companies prefer to operate only part of their equipment, and spread employment by alternating individuals or shifts, or by shorter shifts in continuous operation. Increased maintenance and construction, development of new products and new uses for old products, training and transfer of employees, limitation of time worked or wages received, and other methods are all used in an attempt to keep as many people on the pay roll as possible and at a wage which will at least provide sustenance for employees and their dependents.

Periodic reviews of all employees' earnings and needs are a necessary part of any plan for spreading employment to insure against hardship from spreading employment too thin.

A number of companies reported that through the spreading of employment they had been enabled to give employment to all of their normal force.

The attack on the problem of maintaining and spreading employment has been made on an individual basis by the industrial unit, but a great deal of impetus has been given through the concerted mass action of numerous trade associations and some communities.

The individual plans vary from simple temporary devices for reducing working time and increasing employment to closely coordinated permanent budgetary control procedures for regularizing operations and employment.

The community plan outlined is of recent application, and gives promise of absorbing many workers who would otherwise be without employment. Its advantage lies in the central body for exchanging labor needs.

A number of trade associations have been responsible for concerted campaigns among their membership to encourage the spreading of employment and the consideration of means for greater stability of operations. Special committees have been appointed in several instances to study the employment situation in the industry concerned. These committees act as clearing houses for ideas and in some cases have devised programs for application to the entire association membership. Other associations have secured from their member companies information on methods used for spreading employment and have summarized the experiences in association bulletins or trade papers for dissemination among the entire industry.

The steps taken in several outstanding attacks on the problem by trade associations may be summarized as follows:

1. Appointment of small committee of active members to head the following activities.
2. Survey of employment and business conditions within the industry.
3. Development of a program to alleviate conditions shown by the survey.
4. Collection and dissemination of information on successful methods of handling the problem in the individual plant.

Continued on page 255

William Green

Should America Adopt

The Advantages and
Shorter Working
From Varying

TEMPERAMENTALLY there are two kinds of people in the world: One says: "Progress can be made; how can we contribute to that end?" the other; "we shall do well indeed if we are able to maintain present achievements without incurring the hazards involved in making changes." The first group has aided constructive change, and the other group has consistently opposed it, regardless of whether the proposal dealt with education, politics or human welfare. Labor proposals have uniformly been opposed by the second group.

The two early demands of organized labor were the shorter workday and free public schools. In Colonial days education was a home responsibility, just as training in a handicraft. Children got their first educational training in the home and in private schools. As public schools developed, children were required to attend, their tuition being paid by their parents, their masters or the community. This put the children of the poor on a different footing from the children of the rich. Wage earners organized in unions were among the first to urge our free public school system. Their efforts together with the extension of suffrage were potential in securing the necessary legislation.

Early in the nineteenth century the workday was from sunrise to sunset. The first shorter hour movement set ten hours as the maximum.

The first adoption of the eight hour day was, according to John R. Commons, in the Navy Yard in Charleston, Massachusetts, in 1842, by the carpenters and ship caulkers. A national movement for the eight hour workday came after the Civil War and as a result of the tireless zeal of Ira Stewart of Boston. Stewart taught that wages do not depend upon the amount of capital or the supply of labor, but upon the habits, customs and wants of the wage earners. He held that inventions and machinery increased production and that out of increased production wage earners might raise their standard of living. He taught that a reduction in hours was an increase in wages.

The American Federation of Labor in 1884 adopted a programme of sustained endeavor to establish eight hours as the standard workday. With the establishment of the shorter workday came proposals for the shorter work week. No more dynamic changes can come into the lives of the great majority of our citizenry than free educational opportunities for all and a work week that permits labor to be more than drudgery. Because of these opportunities for larger living, wage earners can make larger contributions to industry and community life and also make larger demands upon civilization.

The opposition to the shorter work week placed its main dependence in economic arguments. Output and production increasingly became the points of contention.

The United States Steel Corporation held out the longest of all important production concerns. It contended that it could not adjust production to a three shift system or afford the additional costs involved. Yet it has overcome the technical difficulties in going upon the eight hour basis, and the eight hour shift has not interfered with increases in net earnings. For the first three quarter periods

of 1926, ending in September, net earnings were \$52,626,826, which is greater than the net earnings for any previous period except the war years of 1916 and 1917. The Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, which unexpectedly went on three shifts, found to its surprise that the system was a financial saving to the company as well as a satisfaction to its employees. The executives of the United States Steel Corporation still seem to have drawn no practical deductions from their struggle of two decades against a shorter workday. Judge Gary recently declared: "I know I can't do as much work in five days as I can in six, and I don't think any one else can." Surely wage earners have a right to demand a more discriminating consideration for their proposals.

The National Association of Manufacturers, a group of employers organized among other purposes for militant opposition to unions, has issued a pocket manual against this proposal.

Their arguments are amazingly like those which were offered a century ago by employers against the ten hour day. Yet the innovations of the nineteenth century did not block the remarkable technical advance that has put us in the vanguard of industrial progress. On the contrary, they encouraged mechanical invention by placing the burden of production on the machine rather than the man, and made possible an American standard of living and a higher type of American citizenry. This stimulus was integrated in the dynamic force that carried things forward.

These arguments are all based upon the unwarranted assumption that the shorter work week entails reduced production. Quite the contrary is Labor's purpose. We realize that permanent progress must rest upon increased output—increased things at the service of human beings. We maintain, however, that we can devise still more efficient methods: Layout, machinery and mechanical power have been geared to a pace based upon human labor power for an eight hour day. If performance must mesh into a higher gear, the work period must obviously be shortened. Reasoning from past experience, the output will be increased. Individual wages should increase with productivity, but this does not necessarily result in higher production costs per unit. Efficient management will prevent that result.

Continued on Page 236

The Five-Day Week?

CON

Disadvantages of the Week Discussed Points of View

Arthur H. Young

I WANT to approach this aspect of the subject first from the side of production capacity and consumption demand. American industry can, or potentially could, produce more goods than the population of the country is able readily to absorb. What I mean to say is that the productive capacity of the United States has outrun the consumptive capacity of our markets. Moreover, it is much easier to increase productive capacity than to enlarge the buying demands of the people. Every industrial engineer knows that with our well-nigh limitless supplies of capital, our yet undeveloped resources, and our inventive genius and managerial ability, the production in almost any line might be expanded almost indefinitely. But consumption is another thing. To sell our products, we must have buyers, and those buyers must have both wants and the money with which to satisfy them. We all know perfectly well that our present level of production and of business prosperity could never have been reached except for the high purchasing power of the masses of the people, including the wage earners. High wages, therefore, have come to be an essential element in continued high production.

High wages, however, cannot be created out of nothing; they cannot be paid simply because somebody wants to or because somebody else wants them. High production, high wages and high standards of living have developed together in the United States and each is dependent upon both of the others.

The simultaneous development of high production, high wages, and high standards of living may be illustrated in the following sequence, which, I warn in advance, is greatly over-simplified.

The first step is taken when increased supplies of capital, advanced management and improved efficiency of labor lead to high production and a large supply of commodities ready to be distributed to consumers.

The next step comes when this increased production, if combined (as it has been in the United States) with relatively limited supplies of labor and a relative excess of capital, results in a rising level of wages. This second step may be postponed or even prevented if over-pro-

duction or some other maladjustment leads to under-employment and a labor surplus, thus reversing the conditions of supply and demand. But high wages, by raising the purchasing power of the masses of the people, work toward the prevention of over-production and under-consumption.

Next in our sequence we reach a condition of steadily increasing production, satisfactory earnings of both labor and capital, and progressive elimination of waste. This highly desirable condition gradually creates a surplus of commodities—not an over-production so long as all the commodities can be disposed of, but, nevertheless, a surplus which has to be distributed.

Actually, this surplus might be distributed in any one of a number of ways. For example, the government might take it over through increased taxes and use it for social or government purposes. Or labor and management might each let down in their efforts and produce less efficiently. This is an alternative, however, which would not be practicable in competitive industry. On the other hand, industry might employ fewer men and let the rest of the labor supply emigrate or be supported directly or indirectly by the employed workers. Still another possibility is that everyone might keep up work and produce constantly increasing supplies of commodities which would then naturally be distributed at steadily falling prices. One other thing might be done, and this brings us back onto the main track of our discussion. The entire labor forces might be kept at work at reduced hours per day or per week without any reduction in earnings. If this were done for any reason of sound economics, it would be on the theory that the increased leisure without reduction in earnings would cause an expansion in the demand for commodities, thus absorbing all or part of the surplus and spreading prosperity among all the people without loss to the owners of industry.

All this may sound like theoretical economics, but it fits directly into the most brass-tack practicalities of business management. It has, in fact, brought us to the point where we can say that if labor employed on a five-day week can supply the actual and potential demands for commodities, at a total labor cost no greater than that involved in a longer period, the shortened week will be a distinct gain to industry in general and to the individual company in particular, since it will add to the purchasing power of consumers without increasing the cost of production. If, however, the total labor cost is increased, the presumption turns strongly against the shorter week, and a reduction in the working period will require for its justification some compelling reason in each individual industry.

The argument, therefore, involves the intensely practical question of whether or not industry as a whole or a particular company can further reduce working time without increasing labor costs, or at any rate, without increasing them to an extent greater than will be offset by the expected increase in profits due to enlarged consumer demand for products.

We should always keep in mind the fact that both wages and profits have to be paid out of what is produced in industry. To persuade ourselves that we can

Continued on Page 237

Green Cont'd

Labor does not suggest an immediate change to the five day week in all industries. The remaining arguments submitted by the National Association of Manufacturers are of an oratorical nature which fail so completely to state any principle with precision that they do not justify serious reply. We all know that the luxuries of one generation are the necessities of the next, and we know also that men who want to work and advance will get further if they assume that progress can be made and do their part in the necessary experimentation to find the means. The familiar straw man, the European competitor, comes at an inauspicious time now that Europe is sending commissions here to study our mechanical progress and to find the "secret of high wages." Methods that have led to progress in the past should not be denied another trial.

The American Federation of Labor resolved to work for the shorter work week, fully conscious that all industries are not equally prepared to introduce the forty hour week. Because we believe that the shorter work week is industrially practicable and expedient and socially wise, organized labor offers its cooperation in developing technical changes and conditions under which the shorter work week can go into effect and usher in a period in which the workers shall find new and greater opportunities for growth and service both as workers and as citizens. The joint efforts of management and those who use the tools and machinery to carry out work orders, will put all past experience to work to find the way to the next big change.

There are industries that should now consider plans for the five day week; these are mining, construction, automobiles, garment-making and textiles.

A part of this higher gearing of industry to maintain output can be expected to grow out of the five day week as its natural effect upon the human part of the industrial mechanism. Experience has proved that the effect of shortening hours is to increase output per hour, and this has not only been demonstrated once or twice but has been the general experience. Allowing a period of one or two months for adjustment, reductions from a twelve hour to an eight hour shift, and from a ten hour to an eight hour shift, in a shell manufacturing operation and glass manufacturing, respectively, have given a nineteen and a half per cent. and a ten per cent. in hours of production, and in the Minnegua steel plant of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company the change from the twelve hour to the eight hour day has resulted in a greater hourly production in every department, according to Mr. Weldon, president of the company. Even where the operation is machine controlled, shorter hours have produced a greater hourly output. Studies of women turning fuse bodies in a munition plant show the following results: when working 66 hours a week they turned out 100 units of production an hour; when working 54 hours, 134 units; and when reduced to 45 hours per week, 158 units. When the hours are reduced below eight a day the increase continues. In the tinplate industry in South Wales reductions from eight to six hours a day brought increases of 4.7 per cent., 8.5 per cent. and 10.6 per cent. in hourly production in three factories investigated. In another factory where hours were reduced from eight to four the increase was 11.5

per cent. Over a period of time the effect of shorter hours is cumulative, the greater physical capacity of the men being reflected in continually rising production curves over a period of several months and sometimes a year or more following the reduction in hours.

All this goes to show that the element of fatigue is an important factor in industrial waste and that the maximum efficiency of the human machine can be had only when rest periods allow ample time for recuperation. The time needed for complete recuperation must be greater where specialization and mechanical devices reduce the workman's part to the constant repetition of a few motions at a high rate of speed. Here monotony and nervous tension produce a greater strain than in work involving greater variety. Certain scientific investigations in England have placed the work time which under existing conditions give the maximum efficiency of the human machine, at forty hours a week.

Another means of maintaining output under a shortened work week schedule is that of stabilizing the industry to prevent seasonal rush and slack periods. Many of our industries are now operating only two-thirds or three-fourths of the working year, owing to seasonal fluctuations and other controllable elements. By eliminating as far as possible seasonal ups and downs, the operation period can be regularized and a larger total yearly output be produced. In the boot and shoe industry, an industry much affected by changes in style and seasonal fluctuations, certain firms have made an intensive study of sales and markets, and through special efforts came twenty per cent. nearer to running full time. This was done by interweaving the manufacture of staples and novelties so as to make up stock in staples during slack periods, by working up advance information on sales, and by cooperation between different manufacturing plants and allied trades. In the building industry seasonal depression has been overcome through winter building programmes, which have equalized constructions through the year and resulted in larger yearly output and saving in overhead expenses due to idle equipment.

W. J. Lanch, vice-president of the Thompson Starrett Company of Chicago, made a careful survey of the unit costs of concrete work, form work and brick work on five large jobs, which clearly showed that the average unit costs of winter operations are as favorable, if not more so, than summer work. He asserted that winter construction is not only practical but desirable, with direct benefit to owner, builder and labor and to the community at large.

Similar experiments have been found successful in other industries, notably in the garment industry, where the five day week is now in effect in larger markets, and in the repair shops of some railroads where a system of union management cooperation has been in effect. These results are suggestive of what may be accomplished by scientific handling of fluctuation problems and of the possibility of spreading output over a longer period, with consequent savings and increases, of using our present industrial equipment to more nearly its full capacity and taking care of unemployment by week and holidays throughout the year, rather than by resorting to seasonal lay-offs.

One of the phases of the shorter work week planning which must be treated most seriously, is that of costs involved. However, we know that increasing the costs of any one element entering into production does not need to increase the production cost per unit. Production involves dynamic forces. If any one operates under changed

Continued on Page 238

Young *Cont'd*

add to wealth by subtracting from it is a form of self-deception.

With hours of labor already reduced to probably little more than half the average of those of a century ago, and with all the conditions of employment vastly more favorable to the workingman of today than they were to his father and his grandfather, it is fair to conclude that the employer, under normal circumstances, is under no moral obligation to reduce the working week below the present standard of 48 or 44 hours. He has a perfect right to consider the question in the light of its probable effects upon his own business and to base his judgment mainly upon considerations of sound economics and good business management.

In thus determining the question upon the basis of the economic effects upon their own industries, different employers are likely to reach different conclusions, since the effects of reducing the working period are likely to vary between individual companies in the same industry. It will need to be determined, for instance, whether it is more economical from the standpoint of overhead costs to run a plant for a half day on Saturday or to shut it down and save the expense of power and other items. Other problems involve the character of employees and the nature of their work, differences in capital investment, and differences between continuous and non-continuous operations.

The arguments based upon the purchasing power of labor and the business effects of an additional day of leisure involve some of the most complicated theories of economics. Upon these theories there is little hope of agreement among either economists or industrial managers. Personally, I do not believe the truth as to this aspect of the question can be settled by arguments or by deductive reasoning. Long before arguments will have reached any conclusion, I believe the question will be settled practically as a result of experiments. These experiments are now in progress in many industries and we should not have to wait much longer for tangible demonstrations in one direction or the other.

I have tried to show that the question of further reducing the working time of American labor is dependent in the main upon considerations that are practical or religious. Blind advocacy and unreasoning opposition are equally futile in reaching the true solution. It is a subject that ought to be approached not in prejudice or belligerency, but in a scientific spirit and with an open mind.—*Extracts, see 4, p. 256.*

H. B. McCormac

It may be that a shorter week is necessary or desirable in the manufacture of automobiles. In this line of industry the most efficient mechanical

equipment is used and the most intensive application of the workers' attention is required.

For other classes of industry a forty-hour week would certainly be harmful. The consequent reduction of units produced would considerably increase the cost. An increase of cost has always been regarded as decreasing consumption, and to this extent a reduction in the hours of the working week would be a step backward, rather than forward.

If we are to have equality of prosperity among occupations, we must have equality of industry, skill and intelligence or training. We need more goods—we can enjoy more leisure. Let's produce the goods and the leisure will follow.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

R. J. S. Schaarzenbach

I DOUBT whether the time has come where five-day operation universally applied will produce the goods which the world needs, at a price which it can afford to pay. And if it has come, the question even then is open whether the five-day week—with a two-day week-end—is the best form for a cut.

Personally, I feel that cut operations whether of a single or double shift nature, should be distributed over the Biblical six days of the week, for the reason, perhaps, that a two-day vacation every week interferes too much with good regular habits. It can be urged, of course, that the present Sunday so does now. But a Sunday of rest is one thing, and a hectic week-end—to which a two-day idleness so easily leads—is another. If the point should be made that some of us seem to enjoy the two-day week-end, I will say that, if a fact, it does not prove the two-day week-end a good institution.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

H. C. Atkins

THE tendency in the United States has been toward shorter hours, larger wages and the net result of the whole proposition is coming to the point where sooner or later industry in the United States is going to be like a "dog chasing its tail."

Enforced attention to business in my estimation is in the long run productive of better citizens than enforced idleness. The position of the United States at the present time, outside of one or two industries, does not justify enforced idleness especially where that idleness is paid for by someone, somehow. What we need in industry in the United States is a policy which will enable us to command not only our own market, but foreign markets, and if God-given daylight and time is wasted by American industry, as it will be on a five-day week, somebody else is going to take advantage of that waste.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Continued on page 239

Green Cont'd

conditions, change may be expected in the performance of other factors.

In considering the costs of the shorter work period as compared with costs under former conditions, we are handicapped by the inadequacy of the records kept by industry. The National Industrial Conference Board has issued a few research reports based on questionnaires without checking up to find out whether deductions were based upon similar or comparable bases. The importance of such checking up is evident when we consider under what diverse conditions the shorter work-day has been introduced in different industries. In some instances there was no adjustment of wage rates; in others, particularly in a time of increases in wages, rates were increased; sometimes management planned to make the shorter workday more efficient; sometimes management failed to assume this responsibility; sometimes management asked the cooperation of labor, sometimes not. All of these factors affect labor costs under the shorter work period. This explains also the diverse opinions on output and costs resulting from shorter work period proposals.

However, it is plain that from the standpoint of national and social progress, the shorter work period is a desirable goal. It is also plain that planning, invention and persistence can find increasingly better ways of doing the same job. This makes it practical to set a definite goal such as the American Federation of Labor adopted at its Detroit convention, and then mobilize all the agencies that can contribute to the realization of this ideal.

The organized labor movement is the standard making agency for all labor in America. It is the only agency that can speak for those that work for wages and it is the custodian of industrial experience and craft skill, as well as the welfare of those who use the tools and handle the materials of production.

Labor power is an indispensable factor in production. However powerful and efficient machinery becomes, there is always need for human control and human judgment in its use. Labor knows that if the area it controls is widened by power and machinery, it needs more vitality and resourcefulness of mind and body in order to keep pace with progress and remain master of the production process, instead of being controlled by it.

For these reasons Labor through its trade unions offers its cooperation in working out the production problems necessary to continued progress. With Labor's cooperation, management can make quicker and greater progress than without. Labor cannot enter into such agreements except through its own agencies which it controls.

The offer of trade unions awaits the decision of industries.—*Extracts, see 3, p. 256.*

D. C. Henny

WITH all the evils of overproduction in evidence, it is natural that it is being charged with being the main cause of our present plight, and it is upon this

belief that most of the proposed remedies are based. Among these are maintaining and increasing consumption, controlling and reducing production, and adding to available credit facilities.

Many of these measures have great merit, and some of them may be necessary for emergency relief. Upon reflection, however, it would seem that the cause of our present distress lies deeper and that it is not overproduction as such that can be charged with responsibility for the distress and poverty suffered by a large part of our population.

Just because there exists a great and unnecessary abundance for all, dire need and shortage for many should not necessarily follow. It should be clear that the fault of poverty can not lie in abundance. The inevitable conclusion is that it must be found in the faulty division of this abundance.

Division of wealth produced is effected through the instrumentality of money payment for labor, raw materials and capital employed. The portion earned by labor is transmitted in the form of money wages. Whether this portion is a fair one as compared to that earned by capital and by supervising ability has been and will be the subject of constant dispute. This question is, however, not seriously involved for the present in the search for the prime cause of our economic trouble. This cause is only partially the proportion of earnings received by labor but is mainly its distribution among labor itself.

During times of overemployment, when the supply of labor is insufficient and every laborer can find work, the money wages are well spread out. Such times occurred during 1906 to 1908, when incoming immigration could hardly supply the insufficiency in the labor market. Another period of overemployment occurred during the war when 4,000,000 men were withdrawn from productive industry and when the work of the remaining population went largely into the production of war material. This condition continued for a few years after the end of the war because of the necessity of catching up with deferred building operations and delayed maintenance.

At all other times there has been unemployment. Thus there has been available a labor reservoir of idle men upon which drafts could be and were being made by industry.

There are many industries of a seasonal type, such as lake navigation, salmon packing, and lumbering, which produce underemployment during part of the year and cause a rise and fall in the stage of the surplus labor reservoir. This carries with it no special hardship, as wages in seasonal occupations are generally high so as to partly cover enforced idleness.

About the year 1885 labor began agitating for a reduction of daily labor hours from 12 to 10, and within five years the attempt was fairly successful over the entire country. The claim of labor was based entirely on humanitarian principles. Its secondary effect, however, was a reduction in the surplus labor available, thereby keeping unemployment down. Abundance of public farming land and the general opening up of the West took its quota of labor surplus.

About 1905, labor unions had grown in strength and succeeded in bringing about the reduction of hours per day from 10 to 8. On both occasions there was a general feeling on the part of employers that these sudden changes would result in shortage of commodities and a rise of prices. No such things happened owing to the rapid in-

Continued on page 240

Charles Cheney

THE American Federation of Labor have now made the five-day week a slogan and announced that its establishment will be part of their policy.

I do not know just what has induced Mr. Ford to adopt this plan, but I have a surmise that he finds he can make in five days all that his market can absorb, in view of the increased output of cars made by other manufacturers which are of a grade to appeal to his former clientele.

The object of the American Federation of Labor is obvious. It is simply one more manifestation of the false philosophy which has guided them from the beginning, which is that restricted output increases the demand for labor and makes for increased compensation of the employee.

A rather curious new argument has been introduced into the discussion of this question. It is to the effect that inasmuch as the producers are also the consumers, they must be given opportunity and time to use and consume their own products; in other words, if those employed in making automobiles have one day a week off in which to use them, the demand for automobiles will increase. This may be true provided that the compensation for the five days is sufficient for the week's needs and for the setting aside of a surplus to be expended in an increased purchase of commodities. Obviously such a result can only be obtained when the output of industry and the profits of industry are large enough to permit of the disbursement of surplus funds arising out of a decreased output.

I do not think that the argument that industry will produce as much or more in five days of eight hours each as it does now in five and one-half or six days, can be taken seriously by a sober-minded man.

So far as I know, there are no data available to demonstrate such an hypothesis. As a matter of fact, labor as at present employed is operating on a very short working schedule and there is no question that the shortening of the schedule has already decreased the productiveness of labor as such. In many cases the increased use of labor-saving machinery has offset the decreased efficiency of labor so as to create an impression that labor itself is more efficient. I do not believe this is the case.

I think that it is very unsafe to establish basic principles regulating the operation of industry upon a short experience in a time of unusual prosperity. Certainly as the world becomes better balanced and as the equilibrium between America and Europe is reestablished, we shall get back to a basis of competition in which it will be most difficult to maintain present margins. When the nations of the world settle down to a real, steady competitive contest, that one which produces most efficiently will hold the leadership. America has a great handicap at present over the rest of the world, but it can easily sacrifice that handicap by letting down upon its productive efficiency.

To my mind nothing could be more unsound than the policy of the American Federation of Labor in seeking

to reduce output. That philosophy strikes at the very root of America's prosperity. The labor union policy of restricting output has Great Britain on its back, and if they cannot cut loose from it the ultimate result will be the elimination of Great Britain in its struggle to maintain its place in world commerce. The final result will be the breakdown of the British Empire.

If we want to initiate a policy founded upon that philosophy the five-day week is a good way to begin.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

W. L. Clause

As a means of curtailing production, when needful, the five-day week is an excellent plan in industries that do not employ processes which are of necessity continuous. As to the question of adopting it as a permanent operative policy, however, I think there is reason for doubt.

The adoption of the eight-hour day has much better justification, not only because it lends itself to all twenty-four hour day operations, but because in many lines of manufacture it has been found that men can do about as much work in eight hours as they can in ten, or even a longer period, but I see no reason whatever for assuming that men can do as much in five eight-hour days as they can in six, as a man should be able to work at his maximum efficiency for eight hours.

Our country has grown and developed on its industry and thrift, and I think there is great danger that the present trend may go too far in the other direction, in both respects.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

T. N. Carner

MORE leisure does not necessarily increase the demand for goods. Even if it should increase the desire for goods, that desire is not an effective demand unless it is accompanied by the ability to purchase. It is quite possible that the leisure would be spent in the cultivation of the arts and graces of leisure, in visiting museums, libraries, and art galleries, or hikes, games, and inexpensive amusements. If the cult of leisure should result in the popularization of Gandiism, humanism or any of the highbrowisms, it would decrease the desire for material goods. If it should result in more gardening, more work about the home in making or repairing furniture, painting and repairing the house, and other useful avocations, it would cut down the demand for the products of our wage-paying industries.

If men are to receive the same wages for a reduced product per worker it will raise the money cost per unit of product. That it would reduce the labor cost (in terms of money) is merely a matter of long division.—*Extracts, see 11, p. 256.*

Henny *Cont'd*

roduction of machinery which completely overcame the anticipated effect of reduction of hours, so that in the end the steps enforced by labor even though advocated on different principles were decidedly beneficial in keeping unemployment from swelling to dangerous proportions.

Since 1905 the introduction of machinery has continued with ever-increasing impetus. More and more labor was set free, but the war came demanding heroic increase of production, and after the war for several years there was need, as previously stated, of catching up with deferred work.

Unemployment was not seriously felt until after 1923, since which time it has grown in intensity in spite of all methods used for stimulating consumption. It was greatly aggravated by the general employment of female labor during the war, which has become permanent and suddenly added heavily to the available labor supply.

If the fact is doubted that man power is constantly being replaced by machinery, it is but necessary to study any type of industry and any class of public work. There is constant effort to cut out labor by perfection and growth in size of the machine units, aided by the universal use of electric power. It is true that part of the labor set free is taken up by employment in machine-making industry and in transportation, but there is a large remaining residue which keeps on swelling the ranks of unemployed labor. This is in spite of constantly rising living standards.

Forced unemployment is repulsive to the sense of justice and is now fully recognized as lowering the average standard of living and reducing consumption, thereby aggravating the original cause.

We may now return to the main question: Is unemployment the necessary corollary of the introduction of machinery? Clearly if it is we had better consider returning to earlier, simpler, hard-working times rather than witness the injustice of a large part of our population suffering and starving. Such, indeed, is the attitude of governing classes in colonial countries. In Java, for instance, 40,000,000 hard-working peasants live contentedly on a small island from which the introduction of farming machinery is rigidly excluded.

Lightening human labor is the object of the use of machinery, but this need not mean unemployment. There is a very plain and simple way at hand to benefit from the former and avoid the latter, a way which has nothing radically new or strange in it, and which, indeed, is being proposed by many economists and labor leaders. The only strange thing about it is that it is not being stressed with greater energy and persistence as the one essential measure without which all other proposed remedies are but palliatives.

This measure is a prompt adoption of shorter working-days, weeks, or months according to the exigencies of various industries, and its essence is that it should be of nation-wide scope and include all industries. Such reduction of working hours has been long since overdue. The point about it which must be stressed is that it should not consist of merely voluntary group employment of a local type, such as put humanitarian employers at a disadvan-

age in competition, nor should it be confined to State or regional lines, thereby seriously disturbing competitive conditions, but it must be national in scope, cover all industries and be thoroughly applied with the one object in view of absorbing idle labor.

It was noted with interest from press accounts some weeks ago that at the Chicago conference of railroad unions and company presidents labor proposed a 6-hour day. According to reports this proposal was turned down for reasons not then stated. The only result finally emerging from this conference was a 10 per cent. reduction of wages.

The attitude of the presidents may well have been that reduction of working hours would be fatal to any industry if applied to it alone, and that for the good of all railroads should be kept from the deadly effect of falling in the hands of receivers. Yet the reply might also have been that a shorter working day would be favored by the roads, provided and as soon as a shorter working day could be simultaneously enforced on all industries alike throughout the Nation.

It is realized that such measure, if it is to be brought about, requires a thoroughly awakened public opinion as to its necessity, besides a sense of frank and fair co-operation between the mass of employees on the one side and the employers on the other.

The measure might take the form of the appointment by the President of the United States of a permanent economic council, on which labor, manufacturers, contractors, railroads, engineering trades, and the power industries should have representatives. It would be the first duty of such council to ascertain from time to time the degree of time reduction necessary to reasonably absorb unemployed labor and yet permit an ever-rising standard of living.

It should recommend the passage of national and State laws governing the length of the labor day in public employment, on public works, and in the manufacture of goods in interstate traffic. Such body might be depended on to oppose other and unnecessary interference by Government with business, but it might consider other matters touching labor such as labor agencies, pensions, insurance, and safety, and publish its findings for the information of the public. Its first consideration, however, should at all times be the practical avoidance of unemployment.

As to the effect on foreign trade, it may be important but it must be remembered that this country can proceed along its own course successfully in a manner that would be impossible for any one of the smaller industrial nations of Europe. This is because the United States constitutes a large political unit, has practically a sufficiency of raw material, and has free trade within its own borders. There is no reason why this country with its enormous domestic market can not work out its own salvation, if necessary, without reference to the rest of the world.

Upon reflection it must appear axiomatic that reduction of working hours is essential before any permanent progress toward recovery can be made, and it is probable that no long time for study is required to decide upon a reduction which can be safely recommended to go into effect immediately. The president of the American Federation of Labor estimates upon apparently correct data that of 30,000,000 wage earners, 8,300,000 are now unemployed. This fact alone would justify a reduction of working

Continued on Page 242

A. L. Humphrey

If Henry Ford is entitled to any meritorious mention or a niche in the Hall of Fame for any achievement of his for the benefit of American industry, let it be accorded to him in the fullest measure.

On the other hand, when he tries to force an impracticable idea upon American industry and American labor for advertising or for the purpose of reducing expenses on account of the falling off of business, under the pretext that he is doing so in the interest of humanity, he is deserving of as much censure as he is credit for the good he has done in the past.

In saying this, I am convinced that I am expressing the view of practically every manufacturer and employer in this country. By his spectacular exhibition of changing the working hours in his plants, creating a week of five working days instead of six, he has done something which can only be applauded by himself. The plan is not only economically wrong and inimical to the best interests of the American working man, but it is also sowing the seed of unrest and dissatisfaction in the structure of our entire industrial machinery. I cannot conceive that Henry Ford in promulgating this plan had any other idea in mind than to add another chapter to his already long list of spectacular advertising feats, or else the conditions in his plants and factories had become such as to make a retrenchment in the working hours a necessary requirement.

The relationship which exists at the present time between American employers and employees does not call for the creation of an extra holiday. If an employee is forced by circumstances of a personal nature, or he wishes for private reasons to take a day off, there is nothing to prevent him from doing so. If he wants to go to a game of baseball or football or take his family to a picnic, he can do so without his employers making the slightest objection.

I am convinced that the average American workman does not want anybody—Mr. Ford or anyone else—to coerce him in curtailing his working hours by arbitrary compulsion.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

A. M. Mulliken

It is assumed by some manufacturers that employees could, if they would, turn out as much work in five days as they do in five and one-half days; that the additional time for recreation would benefit the men and their families; that it would lessen the grind of every-day work; that it would give opportunities, not only for recreation, but for study and attention to personal and family affairs that would be helpful.

It is claimed by these observers that we would have,

on the average, much better results from the five-day work week; better results as regards the individual workman, as regards his family to which he can give more attention, if he will; and, in every way, a strengthening of the man who is employed.

On the other hand, the dangers of the five-day work week, in the opinion of others who are equally qualified to judge, is that the workman—particularly the foreign workman, who is only partially trained in the advantages offered by this country—would abuse the additional time and would waste it in unnecessary pleasures, if not in vicious habits; it would mean a waste of the workman's energy; encourage a disposition to loaf; create a desire for many things that would be not only unnecessary, but burdensome as to purchase and payment and involve men in debt.

It would also create among their families a desire for luxuries and to use the additional holiday for display and injurious amusement.

In other words, this time is wasted if employed in the doing of things which lead to injurious habits.

It is also plain that it is impossible, as a practical condition, for a man to produce as much work in five days as he does in five and one-half days. It is purely assumption that he can do as much in five days.

There is an economic loss in the five-day work week and, unless all manufacturers adopted a five-day work week, it would create such differences in the cost of production that prices would be affected, and they would be compelled to return to the five and one-half day work week.

Unless every manufacturer in each industry works the same number of days or hours, the resulting inequalities would prove the failure of the plan.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

George L. Markland

THE work of this country cannot be done in forty hours a week. I see in the movement a trend toward the *Arena*. Rome did that and Rome died. Most people who work do so with their hands and feet, with no joy in their work, forgetting their heads except their mouth.

The installment plan of buying is so prevalent throughout the country that there may be no reduction in the pay envelope, and with so much more time for the *Arena* the demand for things will increase while the production of things will decrease and without production there will be no profit; without profit there will be no work. Then we will all go to the *Arena*. The men of our country are becoming a race of softies and mollicoddles; it is time we stopped it and turned out some regular he-men—too many paternalistic laws by city, state and nation. Any man demanding the forty-hour work week should be ashamed to claim citizenship in this great country. I see in it a gradual sinking into decay.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Henny *Cont'd*

hours from 44 to 35 or even less per week.

If a council composed of various representative classes of labor, of industry, and of capital should reach a reasonable degree of unanimity on any measure deemed desirable, the public would quickly place itself behind it, and the lawmakers, whether municipal, State, or Federal, would respond promptly to such universal demand.

When the very difficult question of wages comes to be considered, it will be essential that both employers and employees take a cooperative attitude and that the burden of the change shall be fairly divided between producers and consumers. In unavoidable disputes it is only necessary for both sides of the problem to consider what the future might hold in store if no prompt decision can be reached. Without a reduction in the hours of labor, the number of unemployed will inevitably tend to increase, the average standard of living will most certainly be lowered, and consumption will drop, an effort which will aggravate the original cause.

The mental attitude of the unemployed will ultimately be affected by hardships and suffering so that it may become a menace to our social structure. The Soviets will call attention to the injustice of our capitalistic system condemning a large part of our population to poverty in the midst of affluence and point with pride to its own system, which, with all its enormous drawbacks, has at least the advantage of avoiding unwilling idleness.

On the other hand, assume that through overwhelming force of an awakened public opinion shorter working hours are enforced on all. An immediate demand for labor will be created which would at once completely change the present hopeless psychology. Thereafter actual unemployment and the fear of unemployment would gradually disappear and in the minds of millions confidence will be re-established, stagnation will cease, trade will resume its normal activities, and a return to healthy conditions will be possible wherein unemployment will be replaced by greater leisure and the introduction of the age of machinery will prove a blessing instead of a curse.—*Extracts, see 5, p. 256.*

Henry Ford

THE harder we crowd business for time the more efficient it becomes. The more well-paid leisure workmen get the greater become their wants. These wants soon become needs. Well-managed business pays high wages and sells at low prices. Its workmen have the leisure to enjoy life and the wherewithal with which to finance that enjoyment.

The industry of this country could not long exist if factories generally went back to the 10-hour day, because the people would not have the time to consume the goods produced. For instance, a workman would have little use for an automobile if he had to be in the shops from dawn until dusk. And that would react in countless directions,

for the automobile, by enabling people to get about quickly and easily, gives them a chance to find out what is going on in the world—which leads them to a larger life that requires more food, more and better goods, more books, more music—more of everything. The benefits of travel are not confined to those who can take an expensive foreign trip. There is more to learn in this country than there is abroad.

Just as the 8-hour day opened our way to prosperity, so the 5-day week will open our way to a still greater prosperity.

Of course, there is a humanitarian side to the shorter day and the shorter week, but dwelling on that side is likely to get one into trouble, for then leisure may be put before work instead of after work—where it belongs. Twenty years ago, introducing the 8-hour day generally would have made for poverty and not for wealth. The hours of labor are regulated by the organization of work and by nothing else. It is the rise of the great corporation with its ability to use power, to use accurately designed machinery, and generally to lessen the wastes in time, material, and human energy that made it possible to bring in the 8-hour day. Then, also, there is the saving through accurate workmanship. Unless parts are all made accurately, the benefits of quantity production will be lost—for the parts will not fit together and the economy of making will be lost in the assembling. Further progress along the same lines has made it possible to bring in the 5-day week. The progression has been a natural one.

The 8-hour day law to-day only confirms what industry had already discovered. If it were otherwise, then the law would make for poverty instead of for wealth. A man can not be paid a wage in excess of his production. In the old days, before we had management and power, a man had to work through a long day in order to get a bare living. Now the long day would retard both production and consumption. At the present time the fixing by law of a 5-day week would be unwise, because all industry is not ready for it, but a great part of industry is ready, and within a comparatively short time I believe the practice will be so general in industry that it can be made universal.

It is high time to rid ourselves of the notion that leisure for workmen is either "lost time" or a class privilege.

Nature fixed the first limits of labor, need the next, man's inhumanity to man had something to do with it for a long time, but now we may say that economic law will finish the job.

Old-fashioned employers used to object to the number of holidays in this country. They said that people only abused leisure and would be better off without so much of it.

Only lately a French professor accounted for the increased consumption of alcohol by pointing to the 8-hour day, which he denounced as a device which gives workingmen more time to drink.

It will be generally granted that if men are to drink their families into poverty and themselves into degeneracy, the less spare time they have to devote to it the better. But this does not hold for the United States. We are ready for leisure. The prohibition law, through the greater part of the country, has made it possible for men and their families really to enjoy leisure. A day off is no longer a day drunk. And also a day off is not something so rare that it has to be celebrated.

Continued on Page 244

Fayette R. Plumb

LOOKING at the question of a five-day week from the standpoint of the worker rather than that of the employer, it appears to me that he must decide first whether he wants a lower standard of living with less work or to keep on raising his standard by sharing in the benefits of increased production, brought about by improvements in mechanical processes and management. If the movement from a forty-eight hour week to a forty-hour week should be gradual, improvements in the manufacturing and distribution processes might so offset the loss of "manpower hours" as not to cause any actual decline from the present standard of living; but it would keep the standard from rising as it otherwise would.

The only condition under which this would not be so, would be if the total production per man per week would be as great in forty hours as in forty-eight hours, all other conditions being the same. As a matter of fact, a uniform work week for all industries is a fallacy.

In some industries a man may very well reach his maximum productive capacity working forty hours per week on account of the severe physical or nervous strain involved. In another industry a man may work sixty hours a week with no more nervous or physical expenditure of energy. If the work week of such latter industry were reduced to forty hours, the public as a whole, which means principally the workers, industrial and agricultural, would pay for the twenty hours of idleness.

If, for instance, workers in shoe factories now work forty-eight hours per week and the hours are reduced to forty hours with a consequent reduction in the weekly output of each man and no reduction in his weekly wages, the cost per pair of shoes is increased. Who buys the shoes? They pay the shoe workers for eight hours they do not work.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Joseph C. Kimball

UNDOUBTEDLY the five-day week may fit into certain conditions in industry, especially when incoming orders slow up and a given demand can be supplied by part-time operation in the producing factory, but generally speaking, the length of the working week should be regulated by economic considerations rather than by legislation.

Increasingly, industrial products are becoming seasonal and should be so treated even in the length of time spent in their production. Especially is this fact apparent in all articles of wearing apparel and such as are molded or regulated by the element of style.

Good authorities state that style, today, particularly in wearing apparel, is 75 per cent of the value of a contract and no unnecessary restrictions should be inflicted on industry from any source.

Competition in the foreign field is becoming more difficult, and if the United States is to be a factor in export, all interested branches must contribute their part, whether it be capital, management or employee.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Charles R. Sligh

THERE are many industries in which, of course, it would be practically impossible to conform to these hours. The billions of dollars that are invested in the United States in manufacturing plants cannot afford, from an economical standpoint, to be utilized only forty hours per week. The taxes, interest on borrowed money and interest on investment will go on just the same whether plants are worked forty-eight and fifty hours a week or only forty.

This shortening of the hours would inevitably lead to an increased cost of living without any assurance that there would be an increased wage paid. The industries of the United States and the vast accumulation of wealth here has not been made through idleness but through industry and, in my opinion, it is a very regrettable fact that one occupying the position that Henry Ford does in the industrial world should for any reason expect to benefit industrial conditions by so much idleness.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

John E. Edgerton

It is, of course, always possible for it to become unavoidably necessary for individual plants to shorten their hours or weeks under varying economic pressures. But let us not confuse the mandates of good business with the instincts of humanitarianism, nor mistake the disguised suggestions of economic necessity for the discovery of a superior economic formula. If a man does as much work in five days as he has been doing in six, either his energies are accelerated at the expense of his physical welfare or he has not been working as he was obligated to do; and if he be paid as much for five days' work as he has been paid for six, then either he has been paid less than a just wage or is receiving at the hand of charity pay for one day more than he is economically entitled to.

It is time for America to awake from its dream that an eternal holiday is the natural fruit of material prosperity, and to reaffirm its devotion to those principles and laws of life to conformity with which we owe all of our national greatness. I am for everything that will make work happier, but against everything that will further subordinate its importance in the program of life.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Ford Cont'd

This is not to say that leisure may not be dangerous. Everything that is good is also dangerous—when mis-handled. When we put our \$5 minimum wage for an 8-hour day into effect some years ago we had to watch many of our men to see what use they made of their spare time and money. We found a few men taking on extra jobs—some worked the day shift with us and the night shift in another factory. Some of the men drank their extra pay. Others banked the surplus money and went on living just as they had lived before. But in a few years all adjusted themselves and we withdrew most of our supervision as unnecessary.

It is not necessary to bring in sentiment at all in this whole question of leisure for workers. Sentiment has no place in industry. In the olden days those who thought that leisure was harmful usually had an interest in the products of industry. The mill owner seldom saw the benefit of leisure time for his employees, unless he could work up his emotions. Now we can look at leisure as a cold business fact.

It is not easy so to look at leisure, for age-old custom viewed leisure as "lost time"—time taken out of production. It was a suspension of the proper business of the world. The thought about leisure usually went no further than that here were hard-driven working people who should have a little surcease from their labors. The motive was purely humane. There was nothing practical about it. The leisure was a loss—which a good employer might take from his profits.

That the devil finds work for idle hands to do is probably true. But there is a profound difference between leisure and idleness. We must not confound leisure with shiftlessness. Our people are perfectly capable of using to good advantage the time that they have off—after work. That has already been demonstrated to us by our experiments during the last several years. We find that the men come back after a 2-day holiday so fresh and keen that they are able to put their minds as well as their hands into their work.

Perhaps they do not use their spare time to the best advantage. That is not for us to say, provided their work is better than it was when they did not have spare time. We are not of those who claim to be able to tell people how to use their time out of the shops. We have faith that the average man will find his own best way—even though that way may not exactly fit into the programs of the social reformers. We do know that many of the men have been building houses for themselves, and to meet their demand for good and cheap lumber we have established a lumber yard where they can buy wood from our own forests. The men help each other out in this building and thus are meeting for themselves one of the problems in the high cost of living.

We think that, given the chance, people will become more and more expert in the effective use of leisure. And we are giving the chance.

The economic value of leisure has not found its way into the thought of industrial leaders to any great extent. While the old idea of "lost time" has departed,

and it is no longer believed that the reduction of the labor day from 12 hours to 8 hours has decreased production, still the positive industrial value—the dollars and cents value—of leisure, is not understood.

The hours of the labor day were increased in Germany under the delusion that thus the production might be increased. It is quite possibly being decreased. With the decrease of the length of the working-day in the United States an increase of production has come, because better methods of disposing of men's time have been accompanied by better methods of disposing of their energy. And thus one good thing has brought on another.

These angles are quite familiar. There is another angle, however, which we must largely reckon with—the positive industrial value of leisure, because it increases consumption.

Where people work longest and with least leisure, they buy the fewest goods. No towns were so poor as those of England where the people, from children up, worked 15 and 16 hours a day. They were poor because these overworked people soon wore out—they became less and less valuable as workers. Therefore, they earned less and less and could buy less and less.

Business is the exchange of goods. Goods are bought only as they meet needs. Needs are filled only as they are felt. They make themselves felt largely in leisure hours. The man who worked 15 and 16 hours a day desired only a corner to lie in and a hunk of food. He had no time to cultivate new needs. No industry could ever be built up by filling his needs, because he had none but the most primitive.

Think how restricted business is in those lands where both men and women still work all day long! They have no time to let the needs of their lives be felt. They have no leisure to buy. They do not expand.

The people with a 5-day week will consume more goods than the people with a 6-day week. People who have more leisure must have more clothes. They must have a greater variety of food. They must have more transportation facilities. They naturally must have more service of various kinds.

This increased consumption will require greater production than we now have. Instead of business being slowed up because the people are "off work", it will be speeded up, because the people consume more in their leisure than in their working time. This will lead to more work. And this to more profits. And this to more wages. The result of more leisure will be the exact opposite of what most people might suppose it to be.

Management must keep pace with this new demand—and it will. It is the introduction of power and machinery in the hands of management which has made the shorter day and the shorter week possible. That is a fact which it is well not to forget.

Naturally, services can not go on the 5-day basis. Some must be continuous and others are not yet so organized that they can arrange for 5 days a week. But if the task is set of getting more done in 5 days than we now do in 6, then management will find the way.

The 5-day week is not the ultimate, and neither is the 8-hour day. It is enough to manage what we are equipped to manage and let the future take care of itself. It will anyway. That is its habit. But probably the next move will be in the direction of shortening the day rather than the week.—*Extracts, see 6, p. 256.*

D. M. Weir

THE efficacy of a five-day week is somewhat doubtful, even though the business or industry can accommodate itself to such a plan, as seemingly can be done in automobile building.

In the five-day week the human element is the most important consideration. Eight hours' work for five days or forty hours leaves much time for recreation. Men working eight hours hardly need more than that amount of sleep. That leaves seventy-two hours per week for recreational purposes, or over ten hours per day. This additional eight hours of recreation coming on Saturday makes a long weekly holiday period, which will provide an excellent opportunity for additional expenditures.

From a financial standpoint it is hard to conceive labor can benefit by such a plan and it is reasonable to believe it would be but a short time until increased wages would be necessary to meet the increased expense incurred through the added holiday.

Is the human element being abused by forty-eight hours' work? Certainly not in most lines.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Paul T. Norton

I AM convinced that progress results from the development of sound ideas through the co-operation of a reasonably large number of persons, and I think you will find that only those changes have a marked effect on industry as a whole which can be adapted to the activities of a large number of individual plants and that when important changes do occur they nearly always result from experiments which have been tested and found satisfactory in a number of smaller plants, even though some individual like Henry Ford may secure considerable advertising from the spectacular way in which he adopts same.

The question as to whether the American people can enjoy a shorter period of work each week, without curtailing the present steady improvement in the standard of living will not be determined by the procedure of any single individual but by the earnest desire of all persons interested in industry to steadily reduce the large number of non-producing members of society who, while successful themselves, are naturally a burden on and a hindrance to the advancement of those workmen whose accomplishments are for the benefit, comfort and welfare of the people as a whole. By eliminating waste efforts it is possible to advance the standard of living of all the people to a point where occupation furnishes the real pleasure and any form of idleness is considered a calamity.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

I DOUBT if it is feasible in many lines to have a man work forty-eight hours in five days and get the same results as are now gotten in forty-eight hours spread over six days.

Therefore, while admitting increased efficiency in certain lines of manufacturing, I believe the needs of the world today for increased production justify the thought that there should be no decrease in the number of hours and this, too, because of its effect upon the individual as well as upon the industry as a whole.

Mankind does not thrive on holidays. Idle hours breed mischief. The days are too short for the worthwhile men of the world to accomplish the tasks which they set themselves. No man has ever attained success in industry, in science or in any other worthwhile activity of life by limiting his hours of labor.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

William A. Vawter

I AM somewhat doubtful as to the effect on the men who are employed but five days a week. It seems to me that all of us need the discipline of more, rather than less, regular work.

Our own experience is that shortening the hours of labor decreases production. In our opinion, the ideal work week is fifty hours—nine hours on Monday to Friday, inclusive, and five hours on Saturday.

The unfortunate part about the Ford plan is that it will add encouragement to the labor unions to increase their efforts to reduce the hours of labor. This is unfortunate because we know their plan is to limit the amount of work done rather than to tend to increase it.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

W. G. Dickie

No matter how much industrial production might be speeded up by improved machinery and more alert workers, no gain in production could result that would permit a sufficient reduction in price of the products of industry to compensate the worker in agriculture for the longer hours that his industry requires. Since the producers in agriculture provide the great market for the products of our great industries the increased cost of production by virtue of the shortened week would fall largely upon his shoulders. Can he be made to bear the burden of longer hours per day, six days per week, and the increased cost of the products manufactured and not work both an economic and social injustice upon him? I do not think so.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Mary Anderson

DURING the depression there have come suggestions, and no doubt some real attempts, for spreading employment. In slack times in the past there has been a sharing of employment by the workers regularly employed in the busy seasons of industries.

I take it that the spread of employment now suggested is designed to make the hours of labor short enough to open up jobs to additional workers. That would be a splendid move provided it did not carry with it too great a division of the pay envelopes of the employed workers, which in so many instances have been rendered very meager through wage cutting and part-time schedules. Taking pay out of poorly lined pockets to put into empty purses will lead not to the much-needed increase in purchasing power but to a stretching thin of the limited earnings of the masses and a multiplying of the threadbare spots in our economic fabric. More families requiring partial relief in place of fewer families in need of total relief would be the result.

It is said that the industrialist and wage earner are in the same boat, but, as a recent cartoon put it, the wage earner has ordinarily no life preserver of financial reserve. It is undoubtedly true that the business emergency has been too great for the country to maintain all phases of its economic advance, and many employers in trying to reduce expenses have resorted to wage cuts prior to dividend reductions. The serious blow dealt to the worker's wage—that important keystone in the arch of prosperity—has shaken our economic structure to its very foundations.

A real five-day week is the only safe basis on which to reconstruct for the future. A shorter work schedule with fair returns for services is socially and economically sound. It means more general employment for everybody, more regular work for those employed, greater efficiency on the job, more leisure for workers to lead better-balanced lives and to consume certain kinds of goods, and increased purchasing power and development of home markets. A shorter work week is especially important for women in industry, the great majority of whom up to the present have had a schedule in excess of 48 hours, according to studies of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor.

Adjustment of work hours to work methods through a five-day week is logical and essential. The best way to manage our system of mass production with machines doing more and more work is not to have fewer and fewer workers but shorter and shorter hours. Failure to grasp this fact caused a serious piling up of the permanently unemployed and of unmarketable goods even before the depression and helped very materially to precipitate the crisis.

The real five-day week will help immeasurably to restore the proper balance between production and consumption, so seriously upset in the past few years through shortsightedness. The American Federation of Labor states that from 1919 to 1929 workers who produced 50 per cent more through increased use of machines earned only 26 per cent more in real wages. With an advance of 14 billion dollars in the value of products the income of workers rose only 6 billion. If domestic markets are to keep pace with the rapid development of productive power, the system of shortened working time must be combined with payment of a health-and-decency wage, not theoretical but actual.

For 50 years shorter work hours have been a fundamental principle for progress in labor circles. In 1926 the labor movement recommended the five-day week as a standard to be established in all industries in view of the increased productivity of machines. Since then the five-day week has made a slow but steady advance in industry. Over a quarter of a million workers were on such a schedule in 1929, according to the American Federation of Labor.

Today we find a growing enthusiasm among industrialists and employers for a five-day week or shortened schedule in some form. An example of progressive employers who are seeking to develop a more social procedure for combining increased production with the greatest welfare of the human element is a Middle Western manufacturer. In December, 1930, he changed his schedule from three 8-hour shifts in 24 hours to four 6-hour shifts. He succeeded in maintaining earnings through a 12½ per cent increase in rates when the change was first made and another 12½ per cent increase a year later. He was able to increase his working force by about one-fourth, and in regard to efficiency and output his experiment has been found to pay.

Now the finger of industrial progress points to the five-day week as a permanent policy. The only way to achieve this is through legal standardization, so that no employer could work his force of men and women beyond the schedule and working time would cease to be a factor in barter and competition.

The legal standards for limiting the daily and weekly working hours for women that exist today in the 43 States having such laws are far from adequate. Lack of uniformity in these State laws is causing uneasiness among employers, many of whom desire to get together and devise fair standards as a safeguard against competition from firms in the other States. An industry cannot regulate itself unless it can control competition within its own field, and very few industries in this country are so organized. Unfortunately, there are always employers who will seize the opportunity to get the better of competitors, just as there are employees who prefer overtime with double pay to sharing the work with those who are in need of employment. The same human trait of selfishness is behind each group. Through the force of the law the selfish minority can be kept from defeating the ends of the progressive majority.—*Extracts, see 8, p. 256.*

Louise Y. Gottschall

WHILE a five-day week, followed by no substantial reduction in weekly hours, undoubtedly reduces certain overhead costs, the question may be raised as to whether an additional day of rest counterbalances all of the disadvantages formerly found under long daily hours. These disadvantages fall into the main classifications of costs due an inferior quality of production, fatigue, illness and accidents. In point, is the case of one employer who approved the five-day week in principle, but had not been able to adopt it as a regular schedule because there are jobs in our plant at which we feel no man would or should work ten hours daily. The resulting fatigue would so increase the accident hazard that we feel the benefits of a five-day week in such cases are questionable, not to mention the moral responsibility involved.

Closely connected with the question of reduction in hours is that of wage adjustment. In the union trades, the report shows that weekly wage scales have remained unchanged, which of course means an increase in the hourly wage rate. Of the 151 establishments reporting on this point, 89 had reduced working hours. Of the 89, 53 adjusted wage rates to permit the earning of the same wage, 28 made no adjustment, three made a partially compensating arrangement and five increased hourly rates but not piece rates. It is pointed out that the need for wage adjustments would seem greater in the case of employees on hourly or weekly wage rates than in cases where incentive wage systems (i. e. piece rates, bonus system or premiums) are in force, when the employee has some measure of control over his earnings, and, conceivably, can increase them by additional effort and application.

Here, again the question occurs as to whether the purpose of the sixth day, to relieve workers from the augmented strain of industry, is not defeated if in non-union shops the piece-rate worker is forced to speed up in order to maintain the same wage-level, or a higher level to cover increased expenditures resulting from an additional free day. Certainly, further study will be necessary in order to ascertain the actual results.—*Extracts, see 9, p. 256.*

Editorial

ADJUSTMENT to the five-day week would present many practical difficulties. First, for all industry, there would be the necessity of persuading the full-time employee to forego a sixth of his weekly income. On top of percentage cuts already in force, this might prove extremely difficult. Then for countless industries with special time problems the reform would be painful and expensive. It could be effected only through a wholesale relaxation of shop rules, regulations respecting over time and the like. Such difficulties might not be insuperable, but in a regime of private competition they would discourage many employers and produce strife and bitterness. Could the industrial fabric in its present parlous state stand the strain?—*Extracts, see 10, p. 256.*

Of course, if employers are going to play golf all day on Saturdays, they cannot consistently refuse the same privilege to their employees. Then the golf courses and country clubs will become overcrowded. If the employees motor with the family on Saturdays, the roads and highways will become congested and impassable on the last day of the week as they now are on Sundays.

The question whether workers need another day for rest, depends upon the character of their work. In some industries involving severe muscular or mental strain, or where work is performed in excessive heat, dust or gasses, all will agree that rest periods, fewer hours per day or fewer days per week are necessary as well as desirable.

The American Federation of Labor in convention assembled, at the psychological moment grabbed onto the Ford idea and resolutely in favor of a universal five-day week. This attitude is as illogical and as unreasonable as their other proposition that all workers in a given industry should receive the same pay, regardless of skill, ability or productive capacity.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Rowland B. Jacobs

It is recognized that here and there is a strong industry manufacturing a profitable commodity more or less non-competitive, with a country-wide distribution, in which the hours or days per week can be more or less adapted to the situation in which the particular industry finds itself, but our people feel that to force such a radical change upon manufacturers in general would have a very serious and adverse effect upon the industries involved. This, in turn, would be most unfortunate for manufacturers, employees and the public alike.—*Extracts, see 7, p. 256.*

Judge Elbert H. Gary

THE five-day week is impractical in the steel business, and I don't believe it is practicable in any other business.

In times of great business activity, the productive capacity of our industries would not meet the demands of the consuming public if they were operated only five days a week. The only way to meet this lack is by increasing plant capacity, and that additional expense would have to be carried by the consuming public. All the things that increase the cost of production increase the cost to the consumer and that also works to the prejudice of the employee part of the general public not engaged in the particular industry concerned.

It is illogical to work only five days a week and get paid for six. Most people work six days, and it isn't fair for half of the community to work only five days and the other half six days.—*Extracts, see 12, p. 256.*

Bibliography on the Five-Day Week

From a list prepared by Laura A. Thompson,
Librarian, U. S. Department of Labor

ALEXANDER, MAGNUS W.

The five-day week in American manufacturing industries. Index (Svenska Handelsbanken, Stockholm), October, 1930.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR.

Report of proceedings of 46th-50th annual conventions of American Federation of Labor. Washington, D. C., Law Reporter Printing Co., 1926-1930.

— Executive Council.

Report of the executive council to the 50th annual convention, Boston, Oct. 6, 1930. 96 pp.

— Building Trades Department.

Report of proceedings of the 22d-24th annual conventions, 1928-1930.

— Railway Employees' Department.

Official proceedings, eighth convention of Railway Employees' Department, American Federation of Labor, Apr. 28-May 1, 1930. Chicago, Ill.

ATTITUDE OF CERTAIN EMPLOYERS TO FIVE-DAY WEEK.

Monthly Labor Review, December, 1926, v. 23, pp. 1168, 1169.

ATTITUDE OF ORGANIZED LABOR TOWARD THE SHORTER WORK WEEK.

Monthly Labor Review, December, 1926, v. 23, pp. 1166-1168.

BALTIMORE & OHIO RAILROAD ADOPTS 40-HOUR WEEK INSTEAD OF 44-HOUR.

Commercial and Financial Chronicle, June 7, 1930, v. 130, p. 3992.

BARNEY, WILLIAM J.

The five-day week.
General Building Contractor, July, 1930, v. 1, pp. 27-30.

BARRINGER, E. C.

Five-day week reality with Ford; six-day pay total being restored.
Iron Trade Review, Nov. 18, 1926.

BEECHER, BRYANT L.

Five-day week for Chicago printers.
American Federationist, January, 1930, v. 37, p. 57.

BERRY, GEORGE L.

Labor and five-day week.
American Labor World, March, 1927, v. 28, No. 3, pp. 7, 8.

BOWERS, GLENN A.

What of a five-day week?
Factory and Industrial Management, May-June, 1929.

BROTHERHOOD OF PAINTERS, DECORATORS AND PAPER-HANGERS OF AMERICA.

Reports of the general officers to the 12th general assembly, Dallas, Tex., September, 1921. Lafayette, Ind., 1921.

BURKE, THOMAS E.

First national agreement for the five-day week.
American Federationist, March, 1930, v. 37, pp. 279, 280.

BUSINESS WATCHES RELIEF, WEIGHS REMEDIES FOR UNEMPLOYMENT.

Business Week, Nov. 26, 1930, p. 24.

COLLIER, REX.

Secretary of Labor W. N. Doak champions five-day week.
Federal Employee, January, 1931, v. 16, pp. 9, 18.

COMING: A FIVE-DAY WORKING WEEK.

Literary Digest, Mar. 31, 1928, v. 96, pp. 12, 13.

CROWTHER, SAMUEL.

Is the five-day week practical? Interview with Henry Ford.
System, January, 1927, v. 51, pp. 7-9.

— What is Henry Ford going to do?

American Review of Reviews, February, 1927, v. 75, pp. 147-153.

DAVIS, JAMES J.

Shorter workday advocated to solve employment problem.
United States Daily, Sept. 22, 1928.
Commercial and Financial Chronicle, Aug. 9, 1930.

DEBUNKING FORD'S FIVE-DAY WEEK.

Advance (Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America), Nov. 19, 1926.

DE LEON, SOLON.

The five-day week. I. Why it is in order. II. Objections overruled.
Labor Age, April-May, 1927.

DENNISON, HENRY S.

Would the five-day week decrease unemployment?
Magazine of Business, November, 1928.

DE VYVER, F. T.

The five-day week.
Current History, November, 1930.

ECONOMICS OF THE FIVE-DAY WEEK, SOCIAL ASPECTS OF QUESTION NOT THE DOMINANT FACTOR.

Iron Age, June 2, 1927, v. 119, pp. 1599, 1600.

EXTENT OF FIVE-DAY WEEK IN THE BUILDING TRADES.

Monthly Labor Review, March, 1930, v. 30, p. 637.

EXTENT OF THE FIVE-DAY WEEK IN MANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES.

Monthly Labor Review, February, 1930, v. 30, pp. 368-371.

FEDERAL COUNCIL OF THE CHURCHES OF CHRIST IN AMERICA.

The five-day week.

(In its Information Service, Feb. 8, 1930.)

FELDMAN, HERMAN.

Regularization of employment. New York, Harper, 1925.

FIVE-DAY WEEK.

American Federationist, February, 1927.

FIVE DAYS SHALT THOU LABOR.

Literary Digest, May 18, 1929.

THE FIVE-DAY WEEK.

Manufacturers' Association Bulletin, May, 1927.

FIVE-DAY WEEK.

Mining Congress Journal, October, 1927.

FIVE-DAY WEEK.

World's Work, July, 1930.

FIVE-DAY WEEK ADOPTED FOR BUILDING INDUSTRY; New

plan effective August 24 also provides 10% increase in wages for 150,000 New York City workers.

Real Estate Record and Builders Guide, May 11, 1929.

FIVE-DAY WEEK SWINGS ACROSS THE CONTINENT.

Journal of Electrical Workers, June, 1929.

THE FIVE-DAY WEEK IN INDUSTRY.

Typographical Journal, February, 1930, v. 76, pp. 130, 131.

FOX, H. H.

Five-day work week leads to higher efficiency.

Real Estate Record and Builders Guide, Nov. 9, 1929, p. 6.

FREEMAN, GEORGE.

The story of shorter days and the shorter week.

Advance, Dec. 3, 1926.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF BUILDING TRADES EMPLOYERS. Five-day week survey.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL CONFERENCE BOARD.

The five-day week in manufacturing industries. New York, National Industrial Conference Board (Inc.), 1929.

NIEBUHR, REINHOLD.

Ford's five-day week shrinks.

Christian Century, June 9, 1927.

NORTON, HENRY KITTREDGE.

Staggered holidays.

Forum, June, 1930.

PATTERSON, S. HOWARD.

Social Aspects of Industry. New York, McGraw Hill Book Co., 1929.

PAYNE, FREDERICK H.

Will five-day working week increase prosperity?

Industry (Associated Industries of Massachusetts), Apr. 21, 1928.

PROGRESS OF THE FIVE-DAY WEEK.

Literary Digest, Jan. 25, 1930.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY. Department of Economics and Social Institutions. Industrial relations section.

Memorandum: The five-day week in industry; statements of fact and opinion, compiled by the industrial relations section, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J. Ann Arbor, Mich., Lithoprinted by Edwards Bros. [1930].

RASKOB, JOHN J.

What next in America?

North American Review, November, 1929, v. 228, pp. 513-518.

STARK, LOUIS.

Five-day week makes its way in industry.

New York Times, May 12, 1929.

STEWART, ETHELBERT.

Fewer hours and more work to cure labor ills.

United States Daily, May 3, 1930, v. 5, pp. 709, 718.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Handbook of labor statistics, 1924-1926. Washington, 1927.

— Prevalence of the five-day week in American industry.

[Washington, 1927.] 24 pp.

— Progress of the five-day week.

Monthly Labor Review, June, 1929, v. 28, pp. 1181-1190.

VERNON, HORACE M.

The determination of the optimum hours of work with special reference to the five-day week.

(In International Industrial Relations Association. Rational organization and industrial relations. A symposium . . . 1929, pp. 53-61.)

"References," p. 61.

The Students' Laboratory



Articles on the Operation of the Federal Government

Solutions of Problems Involving the Practical Application of the Theory of the American Government

The Students' Question Box

Introduction

ONE of the most interesting and gratifying features of the publication of the CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST is the increasing interest shown by our subscribers in the practical workings of the Federal Government.

This interest is proven by the number of inquiries that come into the editorial offices from all parts of the country and from all types of readers, including teachers, debate coaches, librarians and students in universities and schools.

These inquiries cover a wide range, but in spite of their variety they all present an identical indication and that is that there is frequently a gap for instructor and student alike between a theoretical understanding of the operation of the Federal Government and the practical application of that theory to the current actions of the Government.

For example:

If a class is studying or debating the theory of the Sales Tax or the Soldier Bonus, it should be able to know what the Government is doing on that subject at that time, for the reason that the legally selected representatives of that class, sitting in the House of Representatives, the Senate or the White House, are doubtless wrestling with the same problem from the most practical standpoint—the standpoint of those who are held officially responsible for its solution.

By studying, first the theory and then its actual application, the class is then able to follow the developments in Washington concerning that subject by reading reports of its progress in the daily newspapers with intelligence

and understanding. Versed in the theory only, the student is all too frequently bewildered in attempting to apply it to the actual workings as reflected in the terse reports of the daily press.

It is to bridge this gap, to forge the necessary connecting link in the chain, that the DIGEST inaugurates with this issue a special department in which it hopes to assist in bringing instructors and students of Government in closer contact with the Federal Government in Washington.

In this department all queries regarding the operation of the Federal Government will be answered. In it will appear from time to time special articles by Government officials explaining in simple terms the application of the principles and theory of the American Government to the actual problems before it.

This department will contain special articles on various phases of Governmental practice and procedure, designed to give the student concrete information. So far as possible these articles will be written in the simplest terms. This policy will be followed because it has been the experience of the editors of the DIGEST that the most highly educated persons frequently become confused over Governmental questions because of their lack of familiarity with the methods employed by officials and the somewhat technical verbiage they use. These officials—Senators, Representatives and officers of the Executive branch of the Government—frequently forget that the layman is not versed in Government and, in their writings, presuppose a knowledge on the part of the public that does not exist.

It is to guard against this that an effort will be made by the editors of the DIGEST to have all articles written as simply as possible. In short, clarity, and not the airing of knowledge, will be the object.

All direct questions from subscribers will be answered in the Students' Question Box page, except on such occasions as they may call for the preparation of a special article. When Congress is in session the answers to questions regarding the status of legislation will be given in the department devoted to the Month in Congress.

In this month's number of the DIGEST will be found an article containing suggestions as to how to organize a class for the study of legislative methods. This article was prepared originally in response to a direct request from a student who was a member of a high school class in civics. It was given merely as an outline and a suggestion, with the promise further detailed suggestions would be forthcoming on request after the plan was put into operation.

The same offer that was made to this individual student with whom the editors came into personal contact is tendered to all subscribers of the DIGEST.

In the Question Box this month will be found answers to questions that have been asked about the President of the United States.

The series on How Uncle Sam's Laws Are Made is continued with a chapter on the Committee of the Whole House.

How Uncle Sam's Laws Are Made

Series by Norborne T. N. Robinson

THE following article is the sixth of a series of consecutive articles in which all phases of House and Senate procedure will be described. The articles are being prepared with the aid of the leading parliamentary authorities at the Capital, including members of both the Senate and the House and officers of those two bodies.

WHEN an important bill has been reported to the House by a Standing Committee or a Select Committee and has been called up for consideration by the House it is nearly always considered in Committee of the Whole before being finally acted upon by the House.

The term "Committee of the Whole" is used to designate two committees, one "The Committee of the Whole House" and the other "The Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union." The same characteristics apply to both these committees, the only distinction being in the types of bills or resolutions they consider.

The Committee of the Whole consists of any 100 members of the House present in the Hall while the House is in session. When the bill to be considered is called up, the Member who has charge of the bill moves "that the House resolve itself into the Committee on the Whole for the consideration of H. R. . . ." The motion is put to a yea and no vote by the Speaker. Upon the adoption of the motion, the Speaker appoints a Member as Chairman and then himself leaves the chair.

The rule of the House is that the Speaker may not preside over the House when that body is in Committee of the Whole. He may sit with the House and exercise all his privileges as a Member, but he may not preside.

The rules provide that a quorum of the Committee of the Whole is 100, but usually during the consideration of an important measure, the whole House membership sits.

It is in Committee of the Whole that most of the important debates occur. In fact, practically all important legislation is thus considered since House Rule XXXIII, Sec. 3, provides that:

"All Motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money or property, or requiring such appropriations to be made, or authorizing payments out of appropriations already made, or releasing any liability to the United States for money or property, or referring any claim to the Court of Claims, shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole, and a point of order under this rule shall be good at any time before the consideration of a bill has commenced."

Public bills coming under the above rule are considered in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the

Union, while private bills covered by the rule are considered in Committee of the Whole House.

It is customary, when an important bill has reached the stage where it is to be taken up for consideration by the House, for the chairman of the House committee which reported the bill, or the author of the bill, or whoever has been selected to take charge of it on the floor of the House, to await the disposition of the routine business of the House and then move to go into the Committee of the Whole.

When the motion has been put and carried and the Speaker has turned the gavel over to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, the arrangement of the time for debate is announced and the debate begins.

Sometimes the consideration of a bill requires but a short while and whenever the debate is ended a vote is had. The motion is made by the manager of the bill that the Committee of the Whole report the bill to the House with recommendation that it pass. If this motion carries, the committee rises, the Speaker is called in and the Members resume sitting as the House. The sponsor of the bill announces that he has been instructed by the Committee of the Whole to recommend the passage of the bill and makes a motion that the House concur in the report of the committee.

The Speaker puts the motion and, by viva voce vote, the House passes or rejects the bills according to how the committee has voted.

Any close vote in Committee of the Whole is subject to a roll call, so the decision of the committee thus recorded is automatically followed by the decision of the House.

It frequently occurs, however, that several days are required for the consideration of a bill by the Committee of the Whole. In this case, when the usual hour for adjournment has been reached, a Member moves that the committee arise and report to the House. The committee then arises and reports to the House that it has had under consideration such and such a bill but has come to no conclusion thereon.

Whereupon a motion to adjourn is made and the House adjourns for that day. The following day consideration of the bill is resumed in Committee of the Whole and this procedure is continued from day to day until the bill is finally disposed of.

The Committee of the Whole is in reality a sort of super committee of the House. Through it must filter all the legislation of any importance that has been considered and acted upon by the various standing committees. It is while it is in the Committee of the Whole that a bill is dissected by practically the entire House membership.

Members of the Standing Committee which reported the bill are subjected to the closest questioning because this is the time when other House Members, who have not been able to attend the meetings of the Standing Committee handling the bill, try to inform themselves as to the provisions of the bill before voting on it.

The Committees of the Whole have regular days on which to consider bills, but these will be dealt with in a chapter on the Calendar system of the House.

The Civics Class Becomes the A Suggestion for Enlivening Legislative

THE class becomes a legislative body, to function, as nearly as possible, as the House of Representatives of the United States.

On the first day the class meets it organizes. This organization includes the election of a speaker, a clerk, a sergeant-at-arms and a doorkeeper, and the appointment of committees. To simplify the functioning of the class the method of making up party slates of candidates for officers and committees may be omitted in the initial organization. It may even be well for the instructor to appoint all officers and committees for the first month.

In this event the instructor opens the first day's proceedings as Clerk of the House.

This being a new Congress, there are no officers. In fact there are no members, but simply members-elect, who will become members only after taking the oath of office.

Under the rules of the House of Representatives of the United States, the clerk of the preceding House holds over and is charged with the duty of administering the oath to the members-elect. This, he does, in actual practice, by calling them before the rostrum in groups of about 50 each. (The membership of the House is 435 and to swear them in individually would take too much time.)

After they have taken the oath the clerk then announces he is ready to receive nominations for Speaker and other officers of the House. Each party nominates a member for the Speakership and the roll is called, each member casting his vote as his name is called.

When the result is announced by the clerk, the Speaker is escorted to the rostrum by a committee of his fellow members, designated by the Clerk, and assumes his duties as presiding officer. The other officers are then elected in the same manner.

It may be advisable on the opening day of the class for the instructor to appoint all the officers for the first month and have the students organize themselves at the beginning of the second month. Terms of office in the class-room should be for one month so a new set of officers could be chosen monthly and thus divide the responsibility and experience. The boys could hold all the offices one month and the girls the next, or they could have half the officers each month, alternating with higher and lower offices.

As soon as the House is organized the class should be divided into committees in such a way that every student will serve on a committee at least once during the term. The committees should be arbitrarily divided into majority and minority membership, with the former having a safe margin of votes to insure it controls in the event of a few absences.

With the officers chosen, the actual work begins.

The topic having been chosen, the chairman of Committee No. 1 introduces a bill on that topic. We will take, for example, the World Court, which, although it is not strictly a House measure, will suffice. The Chairman will take the bill to the Clerk's desk and drop it into a basket. (Actual copy of the World Court resolution pending in the Senate will have been supplied by the Congressional

Editorial Note: This article was
taken from a bona fide student
request in the hope that it may

Digest, upon request of any university, junior college or high school class requesting it.) The Clerk will then present the bill to the Speaker and ask him or her which committee it should be referred to, for it is the duty of the Speaker to designate the Committee to which every bill introduced in the House shall be referred.

Committee No. 1 will then be considered, for the purpose at hand, to be the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. The Speaker will then order the clerk to refer the World Court bill to the Committee. The Clerk of the House will then deliver the bill to the clerk of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

When the committees are appointed each must have a chairman, chosen from the majority members; a ranking minority member, chosen from the minority members, and a clerk, who in class work, should be a member of the committee.

There should be a table for the use of the committee. The Chairman sits at the head, on his right sit the majority members. On his left sit the minority members, with their ranking member next to the committee chairman.

Each member has a regular seat and retains that seat at each meeting. In the absence of the Chairman the next majority member in line acts as Chairman.

When the clerk of the Foreign Affairs Committee receives the World Court bill from the Clerk of the House he takes it to the Committee Chairman. The Chairman immediately calls a meeting of his committee, directing the committee clerk to notify all committee members. For class room purposes this committee meeting should be open and held right in the class room. When all the committee members are assembled the chairman says:

"The committee will come to order."

Then all conversation ceases and the committee waits for the chairman to make an announcement. The chairman states that the committee has before it H. R. No. 1 (this means House of Representatives Bill No. 1) providing that the United States of America shall adhere to the Court of International Justice (The World Court) and that before acting on the bill the chairman feels there should be hearings. The majority member next to the chairman then moves that hearings be held. Another member seconds the motion. The chairman then puts the

U. S. House of Representatives

ning Classroom Study of

Procedure

written in Response to a ques-
of Civics and is printed by
be helpful to other students.

motion and the committee votes to hold hearings. The chairman then sets the meeting days of the Civics class for the following two weeks as the dates for the hearings, and the committee adjourns.

The chairman then goes on to the floor of the House and addresses the chair: "Mr. Speaker," he says, "For what purpose does the gentleman from Washington Street arise?" asks the Speaker.

"I arise to notify the House that on October 3d at 10 a. m. the Committee on Foreign Affairs will hold hearings on H. R. 1, providing for adherence by the United States to the Court of International Justice. On that date we will hear proponents of the measure. A week later we will hear opponents of the measure, allowing the proponents a brief period for rebuttal of the arguments of the opponents."

The Speaker then appoints five members of the class (not members of Committee No. 1) to appear as witnesses in support of the bill, and five to appear against the bill, charged with the duty of preparing for the hearing. In anticipation of the hearing they must study the subject and marshal their arguments for or against the bill.

At this point party politics comes into play and it would seem highly advisable that the class be arbitrarily divided into Republicans and Democrats. In one month the Republicans should be in the majority and in the next month the Democrats should be in the majority.

In discussing a bill the students should be required to tell why, as Republicans or Democrats, they support or oppose each bill. They should even be called upon, in debate, to tell why there are Republicans or Democrats because in this manner they will gain an actual knowledge of the principles of the two major American political parties and the difference between them, just as good debate teams study all phases of a subject so they can uphold either the positive or negative side.

After the hearings are concluded the committee meets and votes on reporting the bill. The majority supports the bill and the minority votes against it. The majority prevails and the bill is reported.

The Chairman makes that announcement to the House and asks that the bill be debated and voted on at the next meeting. (On the five-week months two days' debate may

be held.) The time for debate is equally divided. The chairman of the committee reporting the bill leads off. Two members of the committee follow him. Then two witnesses and then some of the other House members, if there is time enough. The same procedure is followed by the minority.

The Speaker must keep time. The Chairman and the ranking minority member allot the time to their respective supporters, but the Speaker holds the watch.

When the debate is closed, the class votes on the bill.

In the meantime the topic for the next month has been selected and referred to Committee No. 2, which is composed of a second group of students. Soon a well-defined routine is established and one bill follows the other in regular order so that the class in Civics meeting once a week has a fresh topic for discussion each month, as well as a fresh set of officers and fresh committee members. By the end of the term each member of the class will have had a practical experience in legislative procedure.

In working out a plan along the lines laid down the instructor and pupils will naturally take into consideration the size of the class and the amount of time it has to devote to these practical studies.

No doubt many situations will arise which are not taken care of in this outline. In these cases the Congressional Digest is at the disposal of instructors and students who may wish aid in working out a pattern that will definitely fit their individual requirements.

The essential points to be considered at the outset, it would seem, are:

1—The setting up of the officers of the Blank School or College House of Representatives. These officers should be a Speaker and a Clerk to begin with. Later, if it should be decided to choose new officers each month by class election, other officers could be added to the list to give zest to the elections. In addition to the Speaker and the Clerk the other regular officers of the United States House of Representatives are the sergeant-at-arms and the door-keeper.

2—The division of the class into groups, each group to remain intact throughout the session as a committee and to function as such in rotation with the other groups.

3—A final debate on the topic by as many members of the class as possible preceding the taking of a vote. In this debate a definite time limit should be set for each speaker in order to give the student practice in concrete, terse presentation of an argument. An examination of Congressional Record covering debates in the House under the five-minute rule, by which each member is limited to a five-minute speech during a certain period in the consideration of a bill, will reveal to the uninitiated student the fact that the most powerful and effective arguments for or against a bill may be uttered within that short space of time.

4—The actual handling of copies of real bills and committee reports of the House of Representatives which can be obtained from Members of the House or through the Congressional Digest. Copies of the Digest containing the history and Pro and Con discussions of many important topics are also available.

Students' Question Box

Reply to queries concerning the Federal Government

Q. Can a foreign-born, naturalized citizen of the United States serve as President or Vice-President? **A. D.**

A. No. Article II, Sec. 1, Par. 4, of the Constitution states:

"No Person except a natural born Citizen, or a Citizen of the United States at the time of the Adoption of this Constitution, shall be eligible to the Office of President: neither shall any person be eligible to that Office who shall not have attained to the Age of thirty-five Years, and been fourteen Years a Resident within the United States."

The provision regarding naturalized citizens in this paragraph covers merely the situation at the time the Constitution was adopted, since many prominent in the affairs of the new nation were British born. Since this provision specifies that a man must have been naturalized at the time the Constitution was adopted, one naturalized after that date is automatically barred. This leaves only native-born citizens eligible and this applies to a Vice-Presidential candidate as well as a Presidential candidate, since the former must be qualified to succeed the latter.

Q. Is a woman eligible for election to the Presidency? **M. A. B.**

A. Yes. Under the provisions of the Constitution quoted above, eligibility is not limited to men but merely to "citizens". Furthermore, the adoption of the Nineteenth Amendment to the Constitution, which was ratified in 1920, removed all question on this point, since it gave to women full voting privileges in addition to the citizenship privileges they already had.

Q. Is it possible for a Presidential candidate to receive a majority of the popular vote and yet not be elected? **C. H. M.**

A. Yes. There are 531 votes in the Electoral College, each State being entitled to the number of electors equal to the number of its members of the House of Representatives plus two, one for each of its Senators.

Thus New York has 45 Representatives and 2 Senators; therefore, it has 47 votes in the Electoral College. Nevada and several other States with small populations have but 1 Representative and 2 Senators; therefore, their vote in the Electoral College is 3 each.

Q. In the event of the death of both the President and Vice-President, who would succeed to the Presidency? **A. R.**

A. Article II, Sec. 1, Par. 5, states:
"In case of the Removal of the President from Office, or of his Death, Resignation, or Inability to discharge the Powers and Duties of the said Office, the same shall devolve on the Vice-President, and the Congress may by

Law provide for the Case of Removal, Death, Resignation or Inability, both of the President and Vice-President, declaring what Officer shall then act as President, and such Officer shall act accordingly, until the Disability be removed, or a President shall be elected."

Under the powers conferred upon it by this section of the Constitution, Congress passed an act, approved January 19, 1886, providing that Cabinet officers in the order of the creation of the Departments they head, should succeed to the Presidency in the event of the death or removal of both the President and Vice-President. The order of succession thus provided is: the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretaries of Agriculture, of Commerce and of Labor are not mentioned in the Act of 1886 because the Departments which they head had not been created at that time.

It is possible, therefore, that a sufficient number of States might be carried by a Presidential candidate, the electoral votes of which combined would give him 266 votes in the Electoral College and would be a majority of the Electoral College, while the total popular vote cast in the remaining States whose electoral votes would go to his opponent, would be greater than the total popular vote in the States casting their electoral votes for the winning candidate.

The reason for this is that a President is voted for by States and not by direct vote. This is because the Constitution of the United States is the creation of the thirteen original colonies, each of which became a State and a member of the Confederation of States after the American Revolution came to a successful end.

These States met, by representation, at the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787, established the United States of America, and wrote a Constitution to govern the Union. In writing and adopting this Constitution, the States voluntarily gave up certain of their individual rights for the sake of the common good. Certain rights they retained for themselves and one of those was the right to elect the President and Vice-President by States and another was to give each State, regardless of its size, equal representation in the Senate.

This was done to protect the States with smaller population from a possible combination of States with large populations in any action the smaller States might consider to be to their detriment.

Q. How are the members of the Electoral College chosen? **M. L. M.**

A. In the beginning of America's political history it was often the practice for the State legislatures themselves to choose the electors; but within a quarter of a century the majority of them had abandoned this practice in favor of popular election. Where this system was adopted it was often the custom at first to have two electors chosen by the voters of the State at large and the remaining electors chosen by Congressional districts—

thus each voter would have the right to vote for three electors, two at large and one from his own district. It was at length discovered that a State's influence in national politics was greatly increased if all of its electors could be carried by one party or the other, and consequently the system of election by districts has been abandoned, in favor of election by general ticket throughout the State at large.

It is necessary, accordingly, for each party in each

State to prepare a list of candidates equal to the total number of electors to which that particular commonwealth is entitled.

On election day, therefore, the voter does not vote directly for President and Vice-President, although for his information the names of the candidates of all parties appear on the ballot. On the contrary, if he votes a straight ticket, he simply votes for the entire list of electors put forward by his party.

Extent of the Five-Day Week

Continued from page 229

monthly employment reports. Such employment reports show that the establishments replying to the questionnaire as to the 5-day week had 3,941,792 employees.

The survey shows that 2.4 per cent of the establishments that made a report had permanently adopted the 5-day week for all or a part of their employees. It further shows that 5.6 per cent of all the employees covered in the survey were on a permanent 5-day-week basis. In some plants where the short week was in effect in part, employees in certain departments were still working more than 5 days per week because it was not practicable to put all departments on a 5-day-week basis.

Plants operating 5 days or less *temporarily* because of the present depression were not included in the 5-day-week group; only industrial concerns that have adopted as a permanent policy the short work week were so classified.

It is evident from information accompanying the replies to the questionnaires, that there is a growing sentiment in favor of the 5-day week in industry, and that a considerable number of those plants that now work 5 days or less per week temporarily will, when the depression has passed, readjust their working schedule on a 5-day basis.

In a study of the figures here presented it must be kept in mind that this is a presentation of samples. It was impossible to circularize all establishments operating in the United States, but the number responding to the questionnaire (37,587) is so large that it probably represents a fair cross-section of industry as a whole. The spirit of coöperation of the bureau's correspondents is evidenced by the fact that 85 per cent of the establishments solicited responded to the inquiry. (From the *Monthly Labor Review*, Sept., 1931, of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, United States Dept. of Labor.)

Plans for Spreading Employment

Continued from page 233

The trade association through its concentrated and intimate approach to industry affords a most influential means of directing the efforts of its members toward constructive action in an emergency such as the present.

Consideration of permanent measures for assuring greater stability of employment and operations has been the outgrowth of the emergency committees of several trade groups.

A survey on the subject of part-time selling in the metropolitan New York department stores was recently made by the Retail Dry Goods Association of New York. This survey indicated that part-time selling was being used by the New York department stores in an effort to decrease costs. The survey also showed, however, that through the use of part-time selling the stores were able to maintain their normal working force, and in some instances a larger force. In eight stores the percentage of part-time employees to total employees ranged from 8 to 23 per cent and the average length of time worked was approximately five hours. The general working time was between 10.30 and 4.30.

One large New York City department store has definitely increased the number of its employees through the use of part-time employment. This store maintains three forces of part-time workers, one working from 10.30 to 4.30, another from 11 to 3, and a third from 12 to 3. Although the original purpose of this move was to increase the volume of business obtainable in the peak period, the practice has had the effect of decreasing the unit-sales cost per employee as well as increasing the total number of employees.

A great many companies which have adopted practices for spreading employment during this present depression, have frankly stated that these measures are of a temporary nature only, and that they are not a permanent procedure.

Statement of Ownership

(Required by Act of Congress, August 24, 1912)

Of THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST, published monthly (except for months of July and August), at Washington, D. C., for October 1, 1932.

Before me, a Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia, City of Washington, personally appeared A. G. Robinson who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says she is the Editor, Publisher and Owner of THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST and that the following is, to the best of her knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in Section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, to-wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publishers, editors, managing editors, and business managers are: A. G. Robinson

and N. T. N. Robinson, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.
2. That the owner is: A. G. Robinson, Munsey Building, Washington, D. C.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding one per cent or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are (if there are none, so state). None.

N. T. N. ROBINSON,
Signature of Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 27th day of September, 1932.

FRANK E. ELDER, Notary Public.
My commission expires April 23, 1936.

This Month's Contributors

Abbott, Henry, President, Calculagraph Co., New York.
Anderson, Mary, Director, Women's Bureau, U. S. Dept. of Labor.
Atkins, H. C., President, E. C. Atkins and Co., Saws, Indianapolis, Ind.
Carnes, T. N., Professor, Political Economy, Harvard.
Cheney, Charles, President, Cheney Brothers, Silks, South Manchester, Connecticut.
Clause, W. L., Chairman of the Board, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Dickie, W. G., Kaw Paving Company, Topeka, Kansas.
Edgerton, John E., President, National Association of Manufacturers, and President, Lebanon Woolen Mills, Lebanon, Tennessee.
Ford, Henry, President, Ford Motor Co., Detroit, Mich.
Gary, Judge Elbert H., Late President, U. S. Steel Corporation.
Gottschall, Louise Y., Associated Editor, American Labor Legislation Bureau.
Green, William, President, American Federation of Labor, Washington, D. C.
Humphrey, A. L., President, Westinghouse Air Brake Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.
Henney, D. C., formerly with the U. S. Reclamation Service, Portland, Ore.

Jacobs, Rowland, Everett Knitting Works, Lebanon, N. H.
Kimball, Joseph, Kimball and Sherman, Haverhill, Mass.
Markland, George L., Junior Chairman, Board of Philadelphia Gear Works, Philadelphia, Pa.
Martien, James Carey, Real Estate Operator, Baltimore Trust Building, Baltimore, Md.
McCormac, H. B., President, Virginia Woolen Co., Winchester, Virginia.
Mulliken, A. M., President, Pettibone Mulliken Co., New York and Chicago.
Norton, Paul T., President, Case, Crane and Kilbourne Jacobs Co., Engineering Products, Columbus, Ohio.
Plumb, Fayette R., President, Fayette R. Plumb, Inc., Philadelphia and St. Louis.
Schaarzenbach, R. J. S., President, Schaarzenbach, Huber and Company, New York.
Sligh, Charles R., President, Sligh Furniture Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan.
Vawter, William A., President, Baker-Vawter Company, Benton Harbor, Michigan.
Weir, D. M., Vice-President, Weirton Steel Company, Weirton, West Virginia.
Young, Arthur H., Society of Industrial Engineers, New York.

This Month's Sources

- 1—National Industrial Conference Board, Inc., N. Y., 1929.
- 2—Report of The President's Organization on Unemployment Relief, 1932, U. S. Government Printing Office.
- 3—Article, *The North American Review*.
- 4—*The Society of Industrial Engineers' Bulletin*, July, 1927.
- 5—D. C. Henney.
- 6—*World's Work*, October, 1926.
- 7—*The Reference Shelf*, Vol. 5, No. 5, 1929.
- 8—Woman's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, Wash., D. C.
- 9—*American Labor Legislative Review*, March, 1930.
- 10—*New York Herald Tribune*, August 8, 1932.
- 11—*American Economic Review*, March, 1932.
- 12—*New York Times*, Oct. 17, 1926.

Special
Educational
Rates

In response to repeated requests from University and High School instructors and students who are using THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST regularly for classroom study and debate preparation, we take pleasure in announcing the following special educational rates for plural subscriptions and bulk orders of one issue.

PLURAL SUBSCRIPTIONS: Ten or more annual subscriptions ordered direct and mailed to one address, with extra desk copy—\$3.25 each, postpaid.

BULK ORDERS OF ONE ISSUE (CURRENT YR.): 10 to 25, 40c each; 25 to 50, 35c each; *50 to 100, 30c each; *over 100, 25c each.

*Plus shipping charges.

"A little learning is a
dangerous thing" — Pope



Students of Government should have
the Benefit of *All* the Facts
with *Pro and Con*
Arguments



The Modern Classroom and Library
is Equipped with
The Congressional Digest
The Pro and Con Monthly

PUBLISHED THE FIRST OF EVERY MONTH EXCEPT JULY AND AUGUST

THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST
MUNSEY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

19.....

Please entersubscriptions for.....years

☐ Enclosed find \$.....in payment.

☐ Will remit on receipt of bill.

NAME.....ADDRESS.....

CITY.....

STATE.....

BY THE YEAR:—U. S. \$8.00; CANADA, \$8.25; FOREIGN, \$8.50; SINGLE COPY (Current Yr.), 50c; BACK No. 75c.

After the Elections
Congress will Convene

Its Actions will be
Packed with Interest

Monthly Reports and
Analyses of the
Work of Congress will
be found in

The Congressional Digest



THE CONGRESSIONAL DIGEST

THE ONLY PRO AND CON PUBLICATION IN AMERICA COVERING CONGRESS